


LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. Copyright No.

Shelf B 1901

F7L2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.



BISHOP FOSTER'S HERESY.

BY

✓
REV. JAMES E. LAKE, B. D.,

OF




~~17/50^a~~
~~1/1~~
THE NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE.

BORDENTOWN, N. J.

1889.
S

BT901
.F7L2

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1889,
By JAMES E. LAKE,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.



INTRODUCTION.

BY A METHODIST MINISTER OF MANY YEARS.

I want to say my best word for this book. It deserves it well, and it deserves a better and more powerful word in its commendation than I am able to utter; and that, too, will come in its time. It is a book for the hour, because it is born of the hour in conjunction with the eternal. It is the expression, true and earnest, of the heart and intellect of orthodoxy in response to the oppositions of science, falsely so called. Hence it must reverberate with welcome force through the church.

An undeveloped philosophy mixed with revelation, makes a hybrid monster, proclaimed as the legitimate issue of advanced religious thought. Such appears the dualism of mind and matter applied by Bishop Foster to the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. Nothing could be more incoherent or more unscriptural. Against it this book strikes the keynote of the old and tried orthodoxy.

Its argument from Scripture is clear as crystal, and stronger than links of steel. This is the supreme argu-

ment for the faithful, who believe in the infallible authority of the Bible, as the Word of God, which is the undisputed doctrine of the Methodist Church, and which we suppose is the doctrine of Dr. Foster as one of the Bishops of that church. Any other interpretation of Scripture than that of this book is harsh and violent; and, besides, this only has the support of all creeds called orthodox. To the law and the testimony is the first and final appeal of the true believer; and it is here all the more important because in the book here criticised Bishop Foster virtually ignores Scripture by leaving it unconsidered, and delivers as final and Christian what appears to him to be philosophical, and because it so appears to his understanding. Let, then, the reader faithfully test "Beyond the Grave" by the sacred word as here expounded in reference to it. Yet the exposition is not anything new, and does not claim to be. The very force of the argument is that it is old as the Bible and Christian interpretation thereof.

Equally clear and cogent is the consensus of the creeds of the churches and the utterances of all the great preachers and divines, who hold to the head, even Christ.

Our author is also philosophical, in the main, in his psychological analysis, in which he expounds the conscious unity of body and mind. If ever there was anything in the sphere of philosophical speculation, which above all things deserves to be emphatically stigmatized as pre-eminently mere drivel, it is the assumption of an absolute gulf of contrast between body

and mind, or matter and spirit, which is the avowed foundation of Bishop Foster's questionable speculations and conclusions.

This assumption is utterly alien to Scripture. It is true the Scriptures make an important distinction between flesh and blood and spirit Matter, in the form of flesh and blood and bones, constituting our present corruptible bodies, is vastly different from the supersensible, spiritual and immortal forms of our life and being. But that is a very different thing from contrasting matter and spirit, *per se*; which the Scriptures never do, unless it be in the passages in which they speak of God as a spirit pure and simple.

This assumption and all the doubtful speculations of "Beyond the Grave" have but one foundation, the much lauded and superficial "philosophy of common sense," thrown up by Reid and Beattie as a barrier against the skepticism of Hume, a philosophy so-called which is despised by all the Germans, and by all philosophically developed minds everywhere; who, since the time of Descartes, have discerned and maintained that all that we know of our body and mind is known as a conscious unity. There is, therefore, no justification either in Scripture or philosophy for the contempt of matter so prevalent in some quarters, and so conspicuous in "Beyond the Grave." Matter has its place as God's creature. By its eternal Creator it is made for immortality as all his creations may reasonably be supposed to be.

For rhetorical effectiveness matter and our body may be called the scaffolding of the spirit. But this

body is composed of material which will never perish. It will be a scaffold forever, though not in the same crude form, and for the same crude form or style of spiritual building. It will be elevated into the spirit rank, and become the scaffold of a correspondingly higher order of spiritual building; the glorified spiritual organization of the glorified spirit.

But while the term scaffold may be allowed as an expression to designate the body in relation to the spirit as supersensible, yet like all analogies it must be limited. "Parables must not go on all fours." Our body is not a mere scaffold; far from it. It is vastly more.

A mere scaffold is always rude and rough, without polish and art. The rougher and less costly the material, the better, as it cheapens the work of the building, and so allows the more of beauty to be put on the building. The builder never cares about the looks of his scaffolding, but only for its strength and availability. Far different is it with the human body in relation to the supersensible spirit. Infinite pains have been bestowed on this sensible element of our being. As a mechanism it has always been the admiration of all human intelligence; and in its better forms and expressions and action, it is a thing of inexpressible beauty and loveliness; and the beauty and loveliness are not a mere accident, but clearly intrinsic to the structure and design of the Maker. Further, the beauty conferred on the body does not so far exhaust or consume the resources which otherwise might be expended on the soul, the figurative building; but, on the

contrary, it often helps the spirit and beautifies it, and always will where the spirit is not perverse.

It is true that this sensible beauty may, in a large degree, be attributed to the supersensible beauty of the spirit, which shows itself through the face. But dead forms are beautiful, and beauty is stamped on nearly all natural things, the inanimate and inorganic. This fact is made one of the conspicuous arguments of "Natural Theology" in favor of the divine goodness. The exanimate human form usually retains its beauty so long as it is unmarred by the process of dissolution. Thus the beauty of the organism remains so long as it is an organism incorrupt and undecayed.

Further, the scaffolding has no office or function in relation to a building as a building in use; but only for what is not yet really a building, but only an approximation to a building, which is certainly not descriptive of all human souls. They are not unfit for use and action like an unfinished building, and the body is not related to them as a scaffold to a rising and untenable fabric. The body is of service only or chiefly where the spirit has a certain sort and degree of completeness. At birth and in the prenatal condition, both, so far we know, are very incomplete and undeveloped, equally so, apparently. They grow and develop together, the spirit through the body, and doubtless also, though less obviously, the body through the spirit. And when the body has ceased to grow, it may, and usually is, the means by which the spirit still continues to grow for a period, as it is the mode of expression and the condition of various forms of experience and information. Then with the

decay of the body there is generally or always some decay in the power of spiritual expression and achievement, and probably in the power of thought itself. It appears probable, if not manifest, that the body is the form of the life of a finite spirit in every stage of its development, in all worlds, to all eternity, the form, rank and glory of the body varying with that of the spirit, just because it is generally the expression of the spirit's life; so that the body, therefore, that now is, shall be transfigured with the glorification of the spirit.

More frequently we meet with the mention of the body under the figure of a house, or dwelling, in which the spirit lives and works, and through which it looks and speaks and thus reveals itself. This, too, is good only as a proximate description of the body. The house is not alive like its inmates; but the body is alive as well as the soul; and only so far as the body is alive do we know anything of the soul; so that so far as both are known as living, they are known only as having or being the one same common life. The same remark, in substance, belongs to the analogy between the body and a tool, or implement, an image much in use by Bishop Foster. Tools are not alive, and they do not have feelings as part of our own consciousness, like our animate body. If we use an animal as a tool, its life is not our life like the life of our body.

In short, the body and spirit are a living, conscious unity. The body feels; that is, it is conscious, for all feeling is consciousness, though it may be of a low order, as it may also be of a high order, according to the rank of the feeling. Therefore, to say that the

body is beastly and idiotic is altogether too sweeping and inconsiderate. It is so sometimes; and in all such cases it is also the same with the spirit so far as it is known to us.

This also is inconsistent with the further allegation that all body is devoid of power or force, as Bishop Foster often affirms. If it is powerless, why stigmatize it as beastly or idiotic? Surely beasts and idiots have some power, and often considerable. All beastliness implies strong tendencies in certain directions, requiring much power to control and restrain them. The powerless cannot be anything of that kind. It must have power of some kind and degree to be beastly. It is no exercise of power to resist and control that which has no power to oppose it.

Now if, as Bishop Foster often affirms as one of the primary articles of his metaphysics, all matter is utterly powerless, it follows that all the power of evil or beastly impulses, desires or action, is only and wholly of the spirit. This, therefore, strikes a fatal blow at his own position. The body ought to be dropped, he argues, to be raised no more, because it is beastly and corruptible and perverse, which is impossible, because powerless—for good or evil, if really powerless. If powerless, all evil (as well as good) is of the spirit, and there is nothing gained (or lost) by dropping the body. It is not worth a word of discussion or remark.

If power of any kind or degree belongs to matter, it may be a good power, or capable of being used for good forever. This conception of it is the only one consistent with the infinite perfection of its Creator.

Nothing is more absurd than to suppose an infinite creative fiat for the production of what is absolutely void of all force, so that it can do nothing, nor suffer anything, nor be the means or occasion of anything. Such a thing so-called would be equal to nothing. It cannot be used as a tool, for a forceless implement is worthless. The steel chisel must have force to cut into the granite; as the prow of the colliding ship must have some little force to cut the other ship in twain. The powerless is utterly incapable of all utility. It is the qualityless—equal to nothing.

However, the good bishop may take which horn he prefers. If powerless, it cannot be evil, and all evil is of the spirit, and nothing is gained by dropping the body; and if forceful, its force as God's creature must be susceptible of enduring good.

Body is not absolutely contrasted with spirit, its opposite in every particular, as some expound. It is the sense form of spirit, the counterpart and expression of the supersensible spirit; and both are apparently made for immortal union, judging from both Scripture and reason—body in its present form for the spirit in its present stage of development; body in its nobler, spiritual rank for the spirit in its glorified estate—all of which is well and clearly unfolded in this little book.

The style of the work is animated; its temper kind; its spirit earnest and Christian. It cannot fail to command attention and excite thought, and it will contribute toward definite conception on the great subject on which it treats.

“METHODIST.”

PREFACE.

Rev. Randolph S. Foster, D.D., LL.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born A. D. 1820. He was converted at the early age of thirteen under his own preaching. At seventeen he entered the work of the Christian ministry in the Methodist Episcopal Church. At the age of twenty-seven he wrote a masterly work on "Objections to Calvinism," which immediately lifted him into the notice of the church. Since then until now he has been very prominent in his church, filling her most important pulpits and places of power. From 1857 to 1860 he was President of the Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. From 1868 to 1873 he was Professor of Systematic Theology in the Drew Theological Seminary; and after the death of Dr. McClintock he became its president. At the General Conference of 1872, held in Brooklyn, New York, he was elected Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. His principal writings up to this date are "Objections to Calvinism," "Christian Purity," "Beyond the Grave" and "Centenary Thoughts," besides some lectures, letters and addresses which from time to time have been

published. The work with which this volume deals is "Beyond the Grave," which was published in 1879 by the Methodist Book Concern, New York and Cincinnati.

The book was published six years after he was elected to the Episcopacy, nearly ten years ago, and some have said to the author of this volume, why notice the book now since it has been before the public so long? My answer is because, 1st, it is still before the public and published by our Book Concern. 2d, because it has never been thoroughly and plainly exposed; and, 3d, because it is a very dangerous book, and until lately I have not been in position to answer it, and hence it was not laid upon me as a duty; but now that I see its error and danger and feel my duty, I can see no reason for allowing it to go on further in its destructive work, simply because it is ten years old and the church has failed to suppress it.

Ten years in the life of a book is but a moment and of no concern as to my reply; if it were a hundred years, my answers would be the same, if the circumstances were the same. I hasten the work beyond my desire because Bishop Foster is soon to go hence; and then it would seem unkind or less manly to answer him, and his heresy would crystalize around his sacred memory and be more dangerous than ever. My time has been so much engaged in the pastorate that I have not been able to give much thought to the mere literary form of my subject, and here must beg the indulgence of my readers. Let me say that I wish to emphasize most deeply, that I love Bishop Foster and acknowl-

edge my indebtedness to him more than to any living man. When I entered Drew Theological Seminary, in 1869, September, I found him with Drs. McClintock, Nadal, Strong and Prof. Buttz, all that heart could wish. From then till now I have never ceased to love him, and while I may seem unkind in my criticisms, it is not so. He has fallen into 'an error and when he sees it, he will be the first to thank me for my humble efforts to shield the church and the world from harm. May the richest blessings of heaven fall upon him in the afternoon of life.

I am deeply impressed with the great task that I have voluntarily taken upon myself; but I enter upon it, as on every important act of my life thus far, with a deep conviction of oughtness that I am unable to banish. After long and earnest prayer I am conscious of an imperative duty. I can do no other. God help me.

"Beyond the Grave," I am compelled to believe, is one of the most dangerous books written in the nineteenth century. It is not written by the hand of an enemy. It is not written with the design to do harm. It is not a coarse, blatant heresy. But it is the work of a master in the arts of sophistical reasoning, after having embraced a subtle rationalism that is hardly known to himself. A rationalism that is more injurious than naked infidelity possibly could be. "Beyond the Grave" is rationalism boiled down and sweetened into a syrup, or sugar coated, so that it is taken along with wholesome food undetected, except by great analysis, like alcohol in patent medicines. Hence the

great danger; overdosing would work its own ruin. But as malaria, though insidious, breaks down the system, so this rationalistic, insidious heresy must work havoc, unless it is counter-worked. I hope under God at least to call the doctor's attention to this malarial poison.

"Beyond the Grave" teaches as a fundamental truth that, "man is a spirit." This is only a half truth, and having adopted this as truth, he is led into all the errors that anyone would naturally come with a false foundation. Once accept this as true, and the conclusions of "Beyond the Grave" must be accepted. Starting with this false premise, "Beyond the Grave" never stops until it traces out the natural conclusion, which is of necessity as false as the premise itself. Hence "Beyond the Grave" is a deadly heresy, touching the fundamental questions of the origin of death and the resurrection from the dead.

If "Beyond the Grave" is not heretical, then our whole theology is inconsistent. I claim that it is false and destructive. Our fundamental doctrines are in danger.

I know the author is a great and a good man, hence the danger. If he were not, he could not do the damage that he now can. These qualities must be possessed before he is able to do much harm.

In 1886 a great epidemic of typhoid fever broke out in the beautiful town of Plymouth, on the banks of the Susquehanna, and thousands were affected, until the whole town was a hospital. Hundreds died. Those who drank from the wells were not affected, those

from the hydrants' supply were. After months of untold agony it was discovered that one man, only one, had died of the fever miles up the stream and the refuse had been thrown on the icy and snowy banks of the stream and hence the death.

The water supply was from a pure stream or the people of Plymouth had not drank its waters. The typhoid germs must come from above or they would not have taken them. They must be very insidious or they would have been detected; so our author stands at the fountain head and pours into a pure stream an insidious heresy, and the outcome must be death.

I know the author, I love him. I do not impeach his integrity or his intelligence. God forbid. But such is the frailty of man that the same may be said of many great but mistaken men; *e. g.*, Origen, Calvin, Luther, Toplady, &c. It is not necessary to impeach their integrity or intelligence to say they were greatly mistaken.

I don't suppose the man that died, or his nurse, many miles away from Plymouth, were demons or fools, so let us divest ourselves of any and all uncharitable judgment, and remember that truth alone is to be sought.

Bishop Hurst has well said, (History of Rationalism, page 2), "The reason why skepticism has wrought such fearful ravages at various stages in the career of the church has been the tardiness of the church in watching the sure and steady approach;" also, on page 587 he very truthfully says, "The true way to meet

the writings of skeptics in the church is by calm replies to their charges, and by immediate ecclesiastical action."

John Wesley wisely says, "The Methodists must take heed to their doctrine, their experience, their practice, and their discipline," and yet nearly a decade has passed since "Beyond the Grave" was published and still no ecclesiastical action has been taken, although some of the most important doctrines have been attacked by one of our ablest preachers, educators and Bishops in such language as the following: "Man is a spirit." "Not simply that there are these two parts to man—an organism of earth and an indwelling spirit—but that the deeper truth, the very essence of his manhood is that he is a spirit." "We consign the quickly decaying form to the grave. We know that it soon moulders to dust. There is not a single sign that it will ever germinate or return to life. There is every indication that it never will. To believe that it ever will is impossible." "However it may awaken surprise, truth demands that we should make the confession that we do not know that death does not end all . . . where he is or that he is at all is absolutely unknown to us." "If the theory that death is the result of sin involves the counter idea that absence of sin would have insured the absence of death, the theory would have to be abandoned; we can scarcely conceive of an authority that could have rendered it credible." "Thus the fashion, habits and necessities of the structure built by life, proclaim death to be normal and primitive. It is born of creation,

not of retribution. It is God's offspring direct, not a penal device. It exists in the bosom of sinless, not sinning, nature."

Is this truth? then our Methodist fathers had not the truth. Is this truth? then orthodoxy has become heterodoxy. I say it is not true, and "Beyond the Grave" assails the very foundations of our Holy Christianity; and yet because its author is a great man, an honored Bishop, the church manifests the same tardiness as it always has done. I love Bishop Foster and all the rest of our Bishops, but I love the church more, and no reverence for any man can compel me to be quiet while the truth and the Methodist Church suffer.

Our author is an adept in argument whether true or sophistical, and he has sown the seeds of heresy deftly, and covered them artfully and with a tenderness born of love, and yet by applying the rigid laws of logical truth, human and divine, he must stand convicted at the bar of an unbiased judgment. If he has the truth, we all want to know it. I for one don't care to believe in a fallacy, no matter how old or how great the authority, but I do not believe in any man dictating to the whole Methodist Church what it shall believe. We have a body of divinity carefully formulated and handed down to us from our fathers; and if I understand our position, no man, be he never so great, has the authority to change or modify those doctrines; and one of the prescribed functions of a Bishop in his ordination vows is to "Be ready with faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erro-

nious and strange doctrines contrary to God's word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same." Can any one doubt that our author has violated that part of his ordination vows? Don't we all know that the above quotations from "Beyond the Grave" are contrary to the standard teachings of Methodism? If these are not erroneous and strange doctrines, then Methodism is erroneous and strange. If "Beyond the Grave" is according to God's Word, then Methodism is contrary to God's Word. Will any one impeach the intelligence of our author by saying that he did not know that he was teaching doctrines that were erroneous and strange as compared with Methodist standards? Will any one admit that he had the right, legal or moral, to stand at the fountain head of his church and instead of "with faithful diligence banish and drive away erroneous and strange doctrines," promulgate them from press and pulpit, both "privately and publicly." If one Bishop has a right to thus use his position to undermine the doctrines of the resurrection of our bodies, another Bishop has the right to assert his peculiar ideas of infant salvation or of the Trinity; and alas! how soon will Methodism be like Unitarianism, unknown and unknowable. I believe in freedom, liberty; but not license. The word of God is not bound. I believe in an intelligent faith that can stand the light of a free, full discussion. But when that full, free discussion, after years, has formulated a creed to which we all subscribe, I protest that no man, after we have elevated him to the highest position in

the gift of the church, has a right to use that position to undermine the faith of those who elevated him. Clothed with the dignity and power of his high office, standing on the vantage ground far above all opponents, in a position for life, O, who can tell the immense harm that may be done! O, who would not tremble to send out through all the lines of thought a book like our author's, clothed with all the authority of the imprint of the Methodist Book Concern, by the greatly honored theologian and great preacher, occupying the highest office in the gift of two millions of Methodists, and that book written upon the great theme "Beyond the Grave," and upon these great questions introducing doctrines that are contrary, not only to the Methodist standards, but are contrary to the orthodox standards of the Christian Church generally. In keeping with this estimate, an editorial in the New York "Christian Advocate," May 3, 1888, says:

"Where they appear and whenever they speak they are considered representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the height they attain fixes the estimate of the denomination in the communities where they live and where they preside in Conferences. More than thirty thousand persons, at a low estimate, many of them consisting of the cream of other denominations, who would rarely or never hear Methodist pastors, listen to the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church as they hold their Conferences in a hundred different cities and towns every year. These form their opinions of Methodism from those who are reasonably supposed to exhibit its best types of spirit,

matter, and manner ; and around the world, whenever in the presence of a minister or a society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they are not beyond their jurisdiction. If, then, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church had nothing to do but to elect Bishops, it would have a work unsurpassed in importance by any similar act, except that of the Romanists when they elect the Pope."

I say, all hail to any better interpretation that can be brought out by the increasing light of the nineteenth century. Turn on the light of any and all new discoveries in the intellectual advancements of the race. The pine-knot, the candle-dip, answered our fathers ; but we have the greater light of the sun lamp and of electric light. Let there be light in every department. Light will not harm the solid truth of God, although it set fire to the drapery. Oh, for a flood of light ! The more light the easier to see the wrecks of effete systems hung about it. Let it burn ; it will only reveal more clearly the truth. Fire does not harm the gold ; it only burns up the dross. Let the giants wrestle ! Let the swords clash ! Let the storms howl around Sinai's hoary brow, and around Calvary's rent summit ! Open Joseph's new tomb. Come see the place where the Lord lay. Handle me and see that I am not a spirit. Truth alone will stand ; error will fall. Let our author shed light upon Bible interpretation ; but do not allow him to blow out the light. " If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen ? " " For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised ? " Let any, yea, all, help clear away the moss

that may have gathered on the rocky foundations of God's immutable truth. Yea, let it be polished as a precious stone, but for conscience sake let us not join with the infidel and rationalist to remove the foundation, or else "what will the righteous do?" I hail with joy Dr. Curry's attempt to set eschatology in a clearer light, but when he says, "The future has no horizon;" that "The Old Testament abounds in 10,000 old wives' fables," I say, hold on. Our enemies can abound in mere assertions. Don't rob us of the truth. Give us light upon the truth. I welcome our author's aid when he would clear the grand old doctrine of the resurrection from any rubbish that may have gathered about it; but when he, by hundreds of pages, would argue from a false premise that man is a spirit, pure and simple, and that his body is no part of him, and leave our old bodies forever in the grave, I cry, *avaunt!*

That our author voices a sentimentalism that is abroad in the Christian Church on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, I have no doubt. In fact I fear that the doctrine is almost superceded by an esthetical teaching concerning the departed soul that makes the resurrection of the body of very little importance. A sermon on the subject is of very rare occurrence. The Apostles went about preaching Jesus and the resurrection, but we go preaching Jesus and the spirit's departure into glory. A prominent preacher of our Conference said to me: "I preach that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord in bliss and ineffable glory. And I know but little

about the resurrection of the body and care less." It may be that I am an old fossil, but I lament and bemoan any such teaching. I know it is not Scriptural. While the spirit absent from the body is with the Lord, yet it is only in the spirit and can only wait for the resurrection of its old companion to be glorified. "Waiting for the adoption; to-wit, the redemption of our body."

Jesus before death we know; Jesus after the resurrection we know; but of the spirit of Jesus during death we know nothing. "Into thy hands I commend my spirit," and those lips are sealed in death, as your friend's and mine. Not one word comes from the depths profound, and the disciples' hopes were blasted. Love embalmed the body; love wept and watched that bruised and dead form. And it was not until the third day that those lips spoke and hope revived. And by the resurrection of the dead body of Jesus the world has hope, not by a metaphysical deduction. The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the fact on which we base our hope of immortality. Plato, thou reasonest well; but thou hadst no fulcrum. Jesus Christ has brought life and immortality to light by the resurrection from the dead. Now, for us to reverse this order, and to turn away from this fact, which must forever remain as the chief ground of our hope of future life, and to turn to the few isolated passages of the Scriptures that inferentially touch upon the condition of the spirit between death and the resurrection, and to force from them an immediate fullness independent of the resurrection of the body that is satisfactory,

without the resurrection of the body, is unwise and unscriptural. I am free to admit that the longing of the Christian for immediate fellowship and glory is the great inspirer of this teaching. Our whole nature would cry with Peter, Why cannot I go now? But sentiment will not do to build a doctrinal system upon. This longing for immediate glory in all its fullness is at the bottom of Spiritualism and Swedenborgianism. And to this same longing we may trace the latter-day sentimentalism about man and spirit and intermediate state nonsense.

Here is the animus of the author of "Beyond the Grave." Mistaking this lower current of sentimentalism for the truth, this *ignis fatuus* for the true light, he enters into the discussion with his whole soul, and this frothy sentimentalism is about to be solidified into the doctrines of the greatest church on earth. I sympathize with this longing. Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, fell with a heavy thud upon my heart as in the cold December we laid the precious dust away and the preacher's words fell with a lifeless meaning, "looking for the general resurrection at the last day," and until I turned to Jesus who said to Martha, under similar circumstances (after eliciting the answer, I know he may rise in the resurrection at the last day), I am the resurrection and the life. Then cheer and sunshine came into my soul, and ever since I have found in Jesus Christ my resurrection and my life. I have not to look away, away, away to the thousands and tens of thousands of years, but apply to my own heart "I am the resurrection," and say with John,

"blessed is he that hath part in the first resurrection;" and only the sinners and unholy need to look into the millenniums of the future for their resurrection. This sentimentalism may do well enough where it is simply floating in the air, but when it resolves itself into a set system like Spiritualism, Swedenborgianism or "Man is a spirit," then it shows its inconsistency with the Bible and orthodoxy as well as sound reasoning. Hence I claim "Beyond the Grave" is only to be analyzed and shorn of its authority, to fall to pieces as the heterodoxies of the past. To this I set my heart by the help of God.

"Beyond the Grave" is a hard book to analyze, because of its lack of continuity. It is a book of lectures rather than a set treatise upon a given subject. It is evidently a collection of the author's teachings for a long time upon different occasions, and upon different subjects, culled out and made to harmonize as best possible, with two long appendixes, into one volume, and named after it was born "Beyond the Grave." If he had christened it "Above the Grave" it would have been better, as he never allows "this man" to enter the grave, and the "animal" never gets out. I shall endeavor to follow my author in his lecture style a little, but hope to so systematize his teachings as to bring them face to face with truth, and then my work will be done and his inconsistency will be evident to all.

BISHOP FOSTER'S HERESY.

CHAPTER I.

"IS MAN A SPIRIT?"

Our author says (page 22, "Beyond the Grave"): "The pivotal and crucial point of the discussion is the question, whether man is a spiritual being or not;" and on page 26, "The proposition asserts, not simply that there are two parts to man—an organism of earth and an indwelling spirit—but that the deepest truth, the very *essence* of his *manhood*, is that he *is a spirit*. Properly speaking, he is a spiritual being, and the earthly form is external and merely instrumental to him. That is what we are required to prove."

Then follows page after page of argument to show this proposition to be true, viz: "Man is a spirit;" and on page 48 he says: "If man is not a spirit, consciousness is a cheat." I wish to leave no uncertainty here. This is indeed "*the* crucial point." Here is the germ of his whole heresy. Admit this and you must admit his conclusions. Our author realizes this and

makes his stand here. This is the citadel of his whole system, hence, he says, page 78, "You see I am making a great deal—everything—of the fact that I am not my body. That is everything to me." Page 32, "The task which I now undertake, is to show that the essential man is an invisible quantity, which never comes within the range of sense-cognition or observation, and is detected by sense only as it comes to manifestation in some visible form of activity. The being himself always remaining invisible; man as a material being is simply an instrumental arrangement or organism for the use of the deeper man, which is a spiritual being, and is separate and distinct from the material organization, as separate and distinct as from any other tools which he uses and employs." . . . He is as really distinct from the hand as he is from the saw, or hammer, or brush, or pen. Page 50, "Am I not conscious that I am different from the instrument I am commanding and using?" "So I bow to my present machine and say, you are about the sixth or seventh that I have had for my use, and the others have vanished away." Page 29, "The form (*i. e.*, the body) is wholly destitute of power of any kind It would not continue to exist as a form for any considerable time if left to itself; it must be fed and clothed, and doctored vigilantly or it would rapidly run to ruin; it is idiotic and beastly; it neither sees, nor hears, nor tastes; it is purely an instrument and servant. The spirit, on the other hand, is a proprietor and master." Page 32, "We must be able, therefore, to show that what you see is not the man, or abandon

all idea of his immortality on rational grounds." Page 56, "We deem what has now been said sufficient to establish the point in hand: *man is a spirit.*"

I feel sure our author has left no uncertainty here as to his teaching. Man is not a materio-spiritual being. "The proposition asserts, not simply that there are two parts to man, but that he is a spirit; the body is not the man, neither is it any part of the man, no more than any other machine he uses." Is this true? Is man a spirit in this sense? That our author teaches it none can doubt, but does that make it true. He says, page 28, "Nothing is more certain than that they are two—completely and utterly dissimilar; and the person is the one and not the other. They have absolutely nothing in common."

To quote further is unnecessary, since 187 pages, all of the work except 82 pages, are in the same line. If we were to quote it all we could find nothing different from this. He closes his first chapter, page 107, as follows: "We have found, upon grounds of reason, that man is a dual being—a spirit shrined in a body; that in the complex, the spirit is pre-eminent—par excellence, the man; that the body is inferior and instrumental—a servant *pro tempore*; that, while it is a needed and useful adjunct for a time, it is in its nature perishable—incapable of permanence," &c.

The second chapter is in the same line. Page 147, he says: "In the change (*i. e.*, death) we lose our earthly bodies." Page 148, "Perhaps, when let out of the body." Page 158, "The resurrection, therefore, is deliverance from the gross body, and resumption of

life without it in the spiritual world." Page 161, "Ignorance and imagination invest the material organism with ethical qualities, but fact and reason teach us that it is only a definite quantity of oxygen and other gases, fashioned in a certain way. The affection the soul has for the body, and the consequent disappointment it would feel at having it displaced by another, is a fond imagination—delusion. Let us cease to be the sport of dreams and the slave of prejudice."

In closing this chapter he says, pages 182-187, "This body of earthly matter I am perfectly willing to put off, that I may put on one that will answer the higher ends of my existence better. Beyond the grave we have found that the spirit is immortal, and that it will be clothed upon with a new form when the old one perishes. It is revealed that they are spirits, and this furnishes some clue. Freed from physical drudgery, they live as spirits. To my mind the future is a vast community of spirits. Thou, Gabriel, that standest nearest the throne, noblest of the archangelic retinue, far on I shall stand where thou standest now."

I think the point is clearly taken by our author. This is the burden of the whole work. He defends his proposition throughout, "man is a spirit." "The proposition asserts not simply that there are these two parts to man, an organism of earth and an indwelling spirit, but that he is a spirit."

Now the question of this chapter becomes patent, "Is man a spirit?" Our author says he is; I say he is not. Let me remind you that we are here and now dealing with the foundation principles of our manhood

as well as those of our theology. The apparent difference may be very slight, but remember, that truth and error in the beginning lie side by side, with not room to lay a hair between them; but in the end or outcome they are infinitely far apart and the gulf is impassable. The cannon may be deflected but a hair's breadth from the mark, but the ball flies at an infinitely farther distance. Two mushrooms grow side by side, so nearly alike that only an experienced person can distinguish them, and yet one is a nutritious diet, the other a deadly poison.

The materialist says man is an animal; our author says man is a spirit. The truth lies between these two errors. "God created man out of the dust of the ground," and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being. Not a spirit, not an animal, but a "man."

If our author is correct, I have no need to go further. If man is a spirit and the body is only a clay instrument that this spirit-man uses as no part of himself—idiotic, beastly, dumb as the horse he drives—I surrender. If the body is only a clay instrument like a clay pipe, and when broken another is substituted, and one after another is substituted until the sixth, and seventh, or tenth supplies the other's place; if the spirit is the man and is no more a part of the body than he is of his pen, or horse, or pipe, then, I ask, must we not reconstruct our theology? Can any man see any use of talking about the redemption of our bodies or the resurrection of the dead. Our author seems to admit the full force of his premise. On page

23 he says, "We consign the quickly decaying form to the grave; we know that it soon moulders to dust; there is not a single sign that it will ever germinate or return to life; there is every indication that it never will; to believe that it will is impossible." The beginning and end of the whole matter is contained in this, "The body shall return to the dust as it was, and the spirit to God that gave it." Let us, then, in the name of conscience as well as reason with our author, "cease to be the sport of dreams and the slave of prejudice."

Thus we see the premise and its legitimate conclusion. "Man is a spirit." Hence he never dies; he lives on; death does not harm him. It in fact relieves him of his body. The body machine, his worn-out, oft-changed instrument, goes back to the dust, moulders and never germinates. We therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; NOT looking for the general resurrection at the last day, or any other day, for it was only a clog, a beastly, idiotic, dumb shell in which the spirit found a shelter, and now he is gone to find a better one more adapted to his exalted sphere. This cast-off thing was good enough to commence in, but he has outgrown this shell and must needs find a better.

Can there be any doubt about the correctness of this? Read page 253, "That at first bodies are indispensable, there can be no reasonable doubt, but at death it has finished its mission." Page 256: "The animal, which served it well, can serve it no longer;

will have accomplished its mediatorial purpose; will have led the immortal to the door of *his* heaven, into which *it* cannot go; and being no further useful, but a clog and shackle, will be left at the gate." I ask again: Is there any evasion of this conclusion? Is this not conclusive evidence that there is no resurrection of the body? Will any sophistry nullify this clear, plain teaching? Can words be plainer? O eternal sh des! Can it be possible?

I admit that our author tries to evade this plain, inevitable conclusion by sophistically reasoning about a transmigration of the spirit at death into another body, which he chooses to call a resurrection. But I am sure it will not deceive any, except they want to be deceived. Page 151 he says: "Nothing is more certain than that Jesus taught, as one of his cardinal truths, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead." Disbelief of that truth is as indisputable heresy as disbelief in the divine mission of Jesus. "I believe in the resurrection of the dead has been the language of faith in all the Christian ages," etc. It must be very interesting to see how a resurrection is taught by one who teaches that the spirit is immortal, and the body mortal forever. But our author is sufficient for even this. Page 181: "The resurrection state is the change of the earthly for the heavenly; is the putting off of flesh and blood, and the putting on of the spiritual body. The resurrection is the standing again after death. The body of the resurrection is the body of which the spirit is clothed for its celestial life. The organizing life principle is identical. It begins in the

natural, and weaves its curious integuments of dust for earthly use; it weaves the new robes for the departing soul."

Page 147: "In the change we lose our earthly bodies, and all conditions of life we lived in them."

Page 224: "The soul wakes up in the future world, or passes into it as it passes from one city to another, with as little interruption of its faculties. In its transfer, however, it loses the services of the physical senses. They have finished their function, and disappear. How this affects its relations to material affairs we do not know. Possibly it interrupts commerce with this life entirely; and on many accounts it is desirable that it should. But if there is the loss of the gross physical sense, we may infer that there is the acquisition of a higher order of sensorium, by which it becomes related to the spiritual realm." Page 242: "When the human body is dissolved, the immaterial principle (the spirit, the man,) by which it was animated, continues to think and act, either in a state of separation from all body, or in some material vehicle to which it is ultimately united, and which goes off with it at death."

Is this in any proper sense a resurrection? Is it a resurrection for the spirit to pass from the body up to God? Do we understand Ecclesiastes to teach the doctrine of the resurrection when it says "the body shall return to the dust as it was, and the spirit to the God who gave it?" Does the hermit crab have a resurrection when it passes from one winkle shell to another?

Since our author bows to his present machine and says, page 50: "You are about the sixth or seventh that I have had for my use, and the others have vanished away," would he have us believe that he has had six or seven resurrections?

I find Transmigration, "From one sensorium into another."

I find Swedenborgianism, "The spirit is clothed upon with a new form when the old one perishes."

"The soul passes as easily from one body to another as we pass from one city to another; one is left behind for the other. The organizing life principle—the spirit, the man—is uninterrupted. He, the spirit, the man, does not die—the body dies. The resurrection is the passing of the man out of the shell into another new shell when the old one is broken. Is this living on of the spirit and the remaining dead of the body a resurrection?

Query: Why should this angel, this master and proprietor, need the help of another sensorium now that it is relieved of its old burden; and if it needs one in the next world, why should our author object to St. Paul's idea, that the old body shall be changed, and adapted to the changed conditions and nature of the spirit. "He shall change our vile bodies and make them like unto his own glorious body. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," as quick as the electrician sets the dead wire into the brilliant light by a touch, and a city is illuminated, so the trump of God shall change us who are alive into the shining representation of our resurrected Lord.

Can any one be deceived by this sophistry! If this change described by the Bishop be a resurrection, I ask, of what? Of the spirit? Was the spirit dead? But he says: "The organizing life principle is uninterrupted." Of the body? But he says, "it will never rise again. To believe that it ever will is impossible." Jesus said to the disciples, "I am not a spirit; handle me and see." He said to John, "I am he that was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore." If there is any resurrection in this transmigration I confess I fail to comprehend it. If this is a resurrection, it certainly takes place at death and deserves to be placed with the heresy of Hymenæus and Philetus, of whom St. Paul says, "their words eat as doth a canker."

Is man a spirit? Our author claims that he is. "We have established the point in hand: man is a spirit," page 56. I say, No; *emphatically, eternally*, No.

CHAPTER II.

IS MAN A SPIRIT?

“Not an organism of earth and an indwelling spirit, but he is a spirit.”

Man is not a spirit in any such sense as our author predicates, but he is a spiritual being, *i. e.*, man is a materio-spiritual being. Man is a trinity in unity. A body of mysteriously wrought material nature, fearfully and wonderfully made, fully associating man with the material universe, from the least atom up to the greatest sun that blazes and burns around the great throne of God; the center of the material universe upon which is built the city of the New Jerusalem, which indeed hath foundation, “whose builder and maker is God.”

A spirit, breathed into this wonderful material body from the living, eternal Father of Spirits. “God created man out of the dust of the ground.” The creative act of God only acted upon the material nature of man. “God breathed into this created man the breath of life, and man became a living being.” Man is created out of the dust. God put into this material nature His spirit and then man became a living being. Homo—man—human being. This body

and spirit became the unique trinity in action. "God created man out of the dust of the ground." Not an animal. Our author's idea that "man's body is as purely an animal as the beast of the forest" is not true. God created the beast of the forest and all creeping things before He created man, and after He had pronounced His work well done, then the holy trinity in council said: "Let us make man in our image;" not in the image of a monkey or baboon. "And the Lord God created man from the dust of the ground." Now, because He created man out of the dust, does that argue that he is an animal—bestly, idiotic, &c. If we could see that unfallen man fresh from the Creator's hands, would we, could we, say: God created man from the material universe, but he is only an animal, bestly, idiotic, devilish, dying, corruptible? Was man fresh from the Creator's hand what our author would make him? I think not; or He would not have breathed into him the breath of life and made him a living, eternal being. No, we see man a fallen being, and the effect upon the body is more noticeable and startling than upon the spirit or soul, because more patent to our comprehension, and the full effect upon body, soul and spirit cannot be fully seen until all are writhing in the pit of culminated guilt after the judgment.

To say that this body is as it was when it came from the Creator's moulding hand, is as great a mistake as to say the spirit and soul of the sinner in all their devilishness are as they came from God. To call man an animal, even the highest animal, a monkey

with a soul, is an insult to both man and God. God created man (not a monkey or other animal) from the dust of the ground—"God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" not an angel, a spark of His own divine nature, and this divine life coalesced with the newly created man, and man became a living soul. A new, unique being, the offspring of God. "Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness;" not an angel, but above angels, a child. Hence David says, "Thou hast created him a little lower than 'Elohim' (God), and crowned him with glory and honor." So far as we are concerned, man is the greatest being in the universe, and represents the Father God, as no other being can, and we know comparatively little of God outside of man; and but for sin he would have been worthy of our highest ideal of God, even without the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ, our God-man. In the face of a child the parent beholds his own image as nowhere else, although he looks into all human contrivances and inventions. The engine, the steamship, the telegraph or telephone are wonderful inventions, but only in the face of his child he finds his own wonderful image reflected. So let our minds sweep the universe of material things, and not in rolling seas or revolving spheres, in shining suns or twinkling stars, in blooming flower or singing bird can we discover the image of the Divine; but in man, God's child. And while we admit the wonderful nature of the spirit, yet we must not forget that God created man out of the dust of the ground, and in connection with that physical nature we only know man, and can only

know him; and in this connection we only know God. What we may be in another world, what other intelligences fill the universe; how we shall see Him who sits in light inapproachable, is revealed to us only through the mediation of Jesus Christ and his word. No philosophy can delve these depths; no spiritualistic speculation can unfold these mysteries. Jesus said, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."—John 1:18. This same Jesus said, "I am the resurrection and the life." "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." "Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and to your God." Again he said, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are God's? If he called them God's unto whom the word of God came; and the Scripture cannot be broken." St. Paul says, "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?"

Man is not an animal with an angel ensconced as a foreign substance, or a being like our author's hermit crab; but a Man, a sublime Unity in Trinity, one unique Being. The spirit, that backlying somewhat that is almost as incomatable as the Father of Spirits; as unknowable as life itself; that inbreathed essence of Deity; the moving mainspring hidden away in the secret citadel of man's inner consciousness; so etherial, spiritual, that its new birth is the hidden secret of our holy Christianity. "Ye must be born again." What! This big body enter the second time into the mother's womb and be born? No. But thy

spirit, thy inner consciousness, thy mainspring of life and being, must be changed, converted, born of the spirit of God. It is a great secret, like the hidden wind; but it is the mainspring of your being; and from this hidden spring must flow all action. Good or bad, as this spirit is, must be the action of the soul, or mind, and also the body. It is not that which goeth into the body that defileth the man, but that which proceedeth from this hidden fountain.

It is not that which cometh into the mind or soul that defileth the man; for who can control his thoughts? This entereth one ear and out at the other, as the body throws off its pollution by the draught. But it is the evil that springs from the fountain; the deep, backlying spirit that sends its polluted stream through the body and soul. And when this hidden spirit is born again, then the fountain, being pure, sends its pure stream throughout the entire being. Now, will it do to say that this unknown and almost unknowable nature, this backlying spirit, is an angel? and that all we know, and can know of it through the mind and body, is only an animal? If we do say this, we may as well stop, for that angel refuses to let us know anything about him only as we study him from his mind and body. He has never been seen, heard, felt, or known to any being that we know outside the body and mind. True, John was in the spirit, but he was in the body also. Paul was lifted up by a mysterious inspiration, but he was in the body. Stephen saw heaven opened and Jesus

standing at the right hand of God, but he was not yet dead.

Munsell lays down this sensible proposition: "However it may be with man in some other world of existence, here on earth we know and can know mind or spirit only as it is manifested in and through physical organization. And any attempt, therefore, to determine, *a priori*, its nature and attributes would be purely hypothetical. Moreover, a science of pure spirit, were it possible to man, would be wholly of speculative value."—*Munsell's Psychology*, p. 4.

Our author himself admits this to be true on page 67: "If it (*i. e.*, the soul) were taken out of the body, whether it might carry on its processes better than it does in the body, is a point which is not at all settled, and we have no means of settling it except upon general inference."

Now, I claim that this inbreathed spirit coming into the man became a part and parcel of his nature. Not two beings, an animal with an angel, as a parasite living upon another. Not two distinct beings, but the spirit so coalescing in the material that man rises in all the dignity of his grand nature, One.

St. Paul prayed, I Thess. 5: 23: "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Upon this Rev. Dr. Adam Clark comments as follows:

"The creature called man is a compound being, consisting:

“I. Of a Body—soma—An organized system formed, by the creative energy of God, out of the dust of the earth; compounded of bones, muscles and nerves; of arteries, veins and a variety of other vessels in which blood and other fluids circulate.

“II. Of a Soul—psukee—Which is the seat of the different affections and passions, such as love, hatred, anger, etc., with sensations, appetites, and propensities of different kinds.

“III. Of a Spirit—pnuma—The immortal principle; the source of life to the body and soul, without which the animal functions cannot be performed, how perfect soever the bodily organs may be, . . . etc. The Apostle prays that this compound being in all its parts, powers and faculties, which he terms *holokleeron*; this whole, comprehending all parts, everything that constitutes man and manhood, may be sanctified and preserved blameless till the coming of Christ. Hence we learn, 1st, The body, soul and spirit are debased and polluted by sin; 2d, That each is capable of being sanctified, consecrated in all its powers to God and made holy; 3d, That the whole man is to be preserved to the coming of Christ. That body, soul and spirit may be then glorified forever with him.”

How does this great Methodist commentator compare with our author? Or rather how does our author compare with Dr. Clark and St. Paul? The creature called man is a compound being, body, soul and spirit. I pray God your whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless. That body, soul and

spirit may be glorified forever with Christ. Our author says the spirit is the angel to be glorified, and the body is to rise no more. Which will we accept?

McClintock and Strong have an able article in which they say: "The Scriptures teach a trichotomy. The body is the first, and the last; the spirit quickeneth by the energy of the soul and is the bond which unites the soul and body; the agent which combines them into a single substance, so that even death is unable to effect more than a partial or temporary separation." Thus the older and the later Methodist authorities agree; and this agreement is with the Bible, and with our outer and inner consciousness.

That man has a material nature, none but an enthusiast or mystic would doubt. To deny it is to deny one of the most sensible facts of being. Every experience and observation show it. The Bible declares that "God created man from the dust of the earth." The Berkeleyan idealist and our author are among the strange phenomena of our race.

That man has a spiritual nature, none but an unaccountable materialism would deny. To prove this from observation is more difficult, because the spirit hides itself so wondrously. The only way is to drive him back step by step until he is laid bare upon the last rock of his own hidden inner consciousness: I exist; I am; I live; I am conscious. Life can only come from life. Matter, as matter, is dead. That inner power must be spirit.

"Anthropomorphism has taken stand in its last fortress—man himself. But science closely invests

the walls ; and philosophers gird themselves for battle upon the last and greatest of all speculative problems. Does human nature possess any free, volitional, or truly Anthropomorphic element; or is it only the cunningest of all nature's clocks? Some, among whom I count myself, think that the battle will forever remain a drawn one, and that, for all practical purposes, this result is as good as Anthropomorphism winning the day."—*Huxley Lay Sermons, &c., p. 163.*

He may say that all life is spirit. We can but answer, we do not know. God breathed into man, and he became a living being.

The Bible believer will have no such difficulty. God created man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being. Sin entered and ruined the spirit; the body finally returned to dust—became disorganized. Jesus came and brought us back to life, soul, body and spirit. "As in Adam we all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," the spirit first and afterward the body. "The body of Jesus died upon the cross and was buried; the spirit returned to God the Father. On the third day His spirit returned, and the body arose, and his mind or soul was active. He walked and talked with men forty days, and after leading them out to Mount Olivet, He in all the entirety of His nature body, soul and spirit, ascended to the right hand of God, where he ever liveth, not as an angel or spirit—"I am not a spirit"—I am not an angel—"I am he that was dead and am alive again, and behold I

am alive forevermore." And John saw him in his glorified humanity.

Our author, on page 34, says: "I mean to affirm that anterior to any organism, and necessary thereto, and distinct from the organism, there must be a thought factor." And our author, from pages 34 to 47, shows very clearly that all the material universe is but the work of this invisible thought factor. The thinker, God, is back of all this organism of matter which, I suppose, every Bible believer will admit. We are not materialists. He says, page 47: "If there be any deduction of reason that may be relied on as certain, it is that the bottom and eternal fact of the universe is a living, intelligent, free, personal spirit;" to which all who believe the Bible and have learned their catechism, say amen.

Now our author leaps to the conclusion that man also is a spirit, and the body is no part of him, as God is a spirit, and the universe is no part of God. Page 47: "The proof is not less strong that man is a spirit." Here we join issue with our author. Man is not God! God has no body or parts! To say the universe of organized matter is God's body, through which he learns objectivity, would be strange philosophy. To claim any analogy to, or to draw any such conclusion from the argument concerning God's spirit nature, and apply it to man as a materio-spiritual being, is far fetched. Man may be such a being in some future state, but that he is not now is too patent to need proof, and all appeals to consciousness, ex-

perience, or observation, or the Bible, will be in vain ; and with Munsell I say, " That any attempt, therefore, to determine, *a priori*, its nature and attributes, would be purely hypothetical." Also with that eminent and wonderful philosopher, Dr. Thomas Dick, who says, (page 300 in *Christian Philosopher*): " For however much we may talk about purely spiritual ideas, it is quite evident, from the nature of things, and the very constitution of man, that we can have no ideas at all without the intervention of sensible objects."

I am sorry that our author should have attempted the impossible, and apparently staked everything upon the issue; for in this same connection (page 48) he declares, " If man is not a spirit, consciousness is a cheat." " Man is invisible." If consciousness is a cheat, who is responsible? But is consciousness a cheat? Who knows? What is the office of consciousness? Does it not relate entirely to my present state, and condition of my mind, and am I conscious that I am a spirit and that this body is no part of me? On the other hand, am I not conscious that it is a part of me? Is not its hurt my hurt? Have I ever had one conscious moment or experience out of the body? Has our author, or any other being known to us, had a consciousness out of the body? Is not every conscious thought or feeling so closely connected with the body that it is impossible to bisect them? Can we be conscious of the past experience and knowledge without the mind, the memory? Can the ego, the self, the consciousness, be conscious without that mysterious sheet upon which are written the past

records? Our author leads us through a most beautiful experience (page 50). In the early morning he is awakened by "the cooing of the dove, and is carried back over fifty years; he becomes a boy again, the father's home, the mother's kiss," &c., which is good rhetoric, but false logic. He says: "By a strange law of association, starting with the early memory, I lived life over again."

Now, what is memory? Is memory spirit? He says on the following page, "That which abides is a spirit. Bodies change and die, only spirit remains." Again on page 53, "The pictures are no photographs on material plates, piled up somewhere—not impressions on nerve surfaces. There is not a particle of materiality about the pictures, the halls where they are hung, or the beholder."

Our author seems entirely innocent of the most patent facts in our mysterious nature. It may be so in some future world; we may be entirely independent of these mysterious material plates, but even a child knows that we are not now, and as we are now constructed it is impossible to conceive such independence of our material nature. A moment's thought will show us the fallacy. If these pictures are hung on some other wall than material, why should a little injury to the brain not only disfigure them, but annihilate them. A clot of blood no larger than a pin point, a blow on the temple, an hour's fever, and the plates are shattered, and the picture gallery becomes a pandemonium or a blank. What of consciousness then? If a slight physical derangement plays such

havoc with our picture gallery, what would the entire destruction do for it? What has consciousness to witness to here? How came our author to know these pictures were not on the material plate of the mind's memory? Has he or any one, save some Spiritist or Swedenborgian, ever been out of the body and away from these frail material plates? had experimental consciousness, that enables him to say that they are not material but spirit? Since it is impossible for consciousness to testify to his assertion by experimental knowledge, how does our author know?

No, consciousness no more testifies that man is a spirit than that he is an animal, and it is doubtful whether it does as much. Consciousness has reference to our present knowledge and must testify to what it knows, and it can know only what it learns in the bodily organism. If our author can point out how the consciousness knows that man is a spirit, we may be led to accept his theory. The Bible does not teach it. Human experience does not teach it. Then how can consciousness be expected to teach what it does not know. I leave it with the reader to see how unwise it is to base an argument for man's spirit nature on consciousness. Our conscious knowledge beginning with the I am, I think, I feel, tracing its way up through all forms of knowledge, may testify to a great many things, but it must tell us its origin, and in proportion as it demonstrates its verifiableness it becomes reliable evidence.

The Bible teaches that we have a body, soul and spirit. Consciousness may do the same. Jesus teaches

that the body, soul and spirit shall live after death. Jesus has proved his authority to teach my consciousness, "I know him;" my soul, my inner consciousness has touched him; I shall live again; I was blind, I now see. Outside of the life, death and resurrection of Christ, there can be no conscious knowledge that man lives beyond the grave, or that there will be any picture gallery when death dashes this material one into atoms; and the resurrection of Jesus Christ has no lesson for our consciousness only as we apply it to the resurrection of our bodies and the relieving of our triune, unique humanity, and the glorification of the whole man "by the mighty power whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

Whenever we philosophize we must be careful that our conclusions agree with fact, either in nature or the Bible, or both, or else it is bad for our philosophy. Our author admits that the question about the soul or spirit's power of independence of the body is only an inference (page 67), and yet carries on his speculation, and affirms that "man is a spirit," while the facts in nature and in the Bible are contrary to his conclusions, *e. g.*, all we know of man is in connection with his bodily nature, and the central fact of revelation is the life, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and with these two facts all philosophy must harmonize or fall to pieces like the billows dashed into spray upon the rock.*

* Since writing the above we have come across an able article in "Christian Thought" on 'Monism,' by Dr. Robert S. Danby, Professor in University of Texas, in which he says:

Now, what to me is strange for a theologian, after pages of speculative philosophy, he closes this chapter by less than a page of Bible proof, page 57. And what is still more strange, every proof-text is diametrically opposed to his theory. Let me quote: "The theory of common sense, thus announced in consciousness, and deducible by the reason and fortified by the deepest philosophy yet attained, has also the sanction of revelation." Now notice his quotations from revelation to prove that "man is a spirit:"

1st. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Our author here overlooks the plain statement that the creation of man was "out of the dust of the ground." Whatever he was, or became, or by whatever process, or power, the proof-text of our author proves that man was created, and that he was created out of the dust of the ground. There is no other creation named in the text. *The Man* is created out of the dust. *The Man* thus created out of the dust became a living being. No matter by what process or by what power; no matter what he became, this new creation from the dust became that being. This is no argument for our author's spirit-man.

2d. Again our author adduces as a proof-text, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

"But consciousness is the subjective faculty. Now, no soul can ever know or realize by consciousness its own beginning," &c. See *Christian Thought*, February, 1888.

What of the resurrection? O, I see; our author says, "The resurrection, therefore, is deliverance from the gross body." "The resurrection is the change of the earthly for the heavenly." "The body is left in the grave, it will never rise; to believe that it will is impossible." Hence, before Jesus rose, the resurrection took place; the bodies of all before Jesus came, returned to dust, and their spirits returned to God. Hence man is a spirit, hence Jesus only animated his old body for forty days to impress the immortality of the spirit upon the race. The man is a spirit, and the resurrection is the relief of the spirit from its earthly clog. Page 163, our author says the "resurrection of Jesus was not a pattern, but a proof;" and page 165, he teaches "that Jesus had not entered the resurrection state during the forty days, and indeed did not until he got out of sight of the disciples above Olivet." O, to what straits for proof-texts.

3d. Our author quotes Christ: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."—Matt. 10: 28.

Christ was here teaching the people not to fear death, for it would be but temporary, and it would be better to obey God, even though death should be the consequence, for if they forsook Him and died in their sins, both soul and body would be cast into hell. But it matters not what He was teaching. I fail to see wherein our author can claim this to prove "man is a spirit," for he clearly and distinctly says the soul and body shall be cast into hell. And he uses

Gehenna, not Hades, the place of eternal punishment. And this is in keeping with the whole tenor of Christ's teaching concerning the resurrection of the body, both of the good and bad. Their bodies, as well as their souls, are to live and enjoy, or endure the results of their earthly life. Now, we have examined these three proof-texts of our author, and can anyone for a moment see wherein they answer the purpose for which he uses them. The *first* makes man from the dust. The *second* leaves the resurrection entirely out. The *third* leaves man, soul and body suffering together in the last place known to a lost sinner in Scripture. I cannot understand our author. In the face of these plain texts he exclaims: "It is the spirit that was created." I say the text says God created man out of the dust. If it is the spirit that was created, it was created out of the dust. There is no creation of spirit mentioned. Again, he says: "It is the spirit for whom atonement is made." Paul says: "He is the redeemer of our bodies." If the blood of the body of Jesus redeems, I should think the human body, to which the body of Jesus is in all points like, worthy of redemption. Heb. 10:5-30:

5. Wherefore, when He cometh into the world, He saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me.

9. Then said He, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second.

10. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ; once *for all*.

12. But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God.

14. For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.

19. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,

20. By a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, His flesh,

22. Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.

29. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?

[Let us beware how we despise the body,]

30. For we know him that hath said, Vengeance *belongeth* unto me.

“We wait,” saith St. Paul, “the redemption of our bodies.” Our author says: “If the Bible is divine, the doctrine is true”—“man is a spirit.”

I say: *If the Bible is divine, the doctrine is not true*—man is not a spirit, but a materio-spiritual being.

I do not think it necessary to follow this line of thought further here. In the chapter on "Inccnsistencies" I will notice somewhat more, but for the present let us turn our attention to our author's more palpable heresy, as related to more practical theology.

CHAPTER III.

BISHOP FOSTER'S HERESY IN THE LIGHT OF THE RESURRECTION AS TAUGHT BY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH FROM THE APOSTLES UNTIL NOW.

In this chapter I shall show that our author's premise, "Man is a spirit," and its outcome, the body never rises from the dead, is contrary to the teaching of the Christian Church from the beginning until now. I shall not quote exhaustively at all, but shall quote from those authors that are acknowledged to be authoritative, and will be as conclusive as if I gave a whole volume on this chapter, for I claim that there is but one voice in the teaching of the church upon the subject. Not but there are wide disagreements in non-essentials. One holds to a literalism that another repudiates. Another holds that the spiritual change that comes over or upon the material nature is so great, that the body will be fitted for the highest state possible. One holds that every atom of the old body will be preserved; another that from a germ of the old body will come a new one, and thus they have their various theories of the how and the what. But that there will be a resurrection of the dead, material nature, and that the spirit shall re-enter the old body

at the resurrection all changed and glorified, there is but one voice in the Christian Church.

Now I propose to show that our author is outside the pale of orthodoxy, because he teaches that man is a spirit, and consequently, needs no physical body after this one is dead. We have no objection to the teaching of any in regard to the most glorious change possible to conceive being wrought in the old body. Make it as glorious and thoroughly spiritualized as Christ's own glorious body. Leave all the corruptible, non-essential elements you please in the dust from whence it came, but from that dead material body we must have our future material body. "God gives to each seed its own body." Make it as different as a diet of milk alone would differ from a diet of beet and vegetables; as different as the Esquimaux from the fairest Caucasian; as different as the blackest Ethiopian to the fairest rosy-cheeked white damsel; yea, let the change be as great as from the sin-cursed drunkard to the bright-eyed babe; or from the fallen, earthly Adamic nature to the most ethereal, Christ-like Moses and Elijah on Mount Hermon; or the prophet that John mistook for an angel, I have no objection. In fact, I suppose it has not entered into our hearts to conceive the glory that awaits this old body in the glory of the resurrection morn. This creeping, fallen, sin-cursed body shall be changed, and made like unto his own glorious body; and as seen by St. Paul on the Plains of Damascus, or St. John on the Isle of Patmos, it is glorious; and I suppose as the heat of the crucible converts the black, filthy coal into the beauti-

ful gas jets sparkling in the many colored chandeliers of my parlor ; or the carbon of the charcoal in the laboratory of nature is converted into the brilliant diamond, so the crucible of death and the grave shall be used by Divine Power to change this corruption into incorruption. My poor body shall be changed, and my spirit shall be clothed upon with this body of electricity, and with wings of light I shall be prepared for my glorious mansion in realms of light and glory. I shall shine like Him whose face was like the sun, and whose feet were like polished brass, "as the stars forever and ever." I am willing for all this, but I am not willing to leave this old friend in the grave. I am not willing for it to lead me to the gate of my immortal home, and there to say, you can serve me no further. You have been a faithful servant, but I despise you now, you old beastly, idiotic thing. No, no; I protest, I'll not treat an old friend so. Here is the heresy of our author to which I object, page 256: "The animal (*i. e.*, the body) which served it (*i. e.*, the spirit) well, can serve it no longer; will have accomplished its mediatorial purpose; will have led the immortal to the door of heaven, into which it cannot go, and being no further useful, but a clog and shackle, will be left at the grave." If I need a body here and now, I will need one there and then. If I do need one I want my old one changed, and the Bible teaches that I shall have it, and the Christian Church teaches the resurrection of the old dead body, from the Apostles till now, and Bishop Foster's heresy is plainly shown in the comparison.

John Wesley says (page 513, vol. 2, Sermons): "When we have obtained the resurrection unto life, *our bodies* will be spiritualized—purified and refined from their earthly grossness. Then they will be fit instruments for the soul in all its divine and heavenly employment. We shall not be weary of singing praises to God through infinite ages."

Here, John Wesley says, *our bodies will* be refined from *their* grossness; there *they* will be fit, &c.

Our author says: "The animal can serve it no longer and will be left at the grave." Need I point out the impassable gulf between these two authors? One teaches the resurrection, the other does not.

Again, John Wesley teaches (on page 507, vol. 2, Sermons): "And we may observe that the Gentiles were most displeased with this article of the Christian faith; it was one of the last things the heathens believed, and it is to this day the chief objection to Christianity. [Is this the reason our author fails as yet to accept it?] How are the dead raised up? With what body do they come? In my discourse on these words I shall show three things:

"I. I shall show, That the resurrection of the self-same body that died and was buried, contains nothing in it incredible or impossible; but before I do this, it may be proper to mention some of the reasons upon which this article of our faith is built. And,

"1st. The plain notion of a resurrection requires that the self-same body that died should rise again. Nothing can be said to be raised again but that very body that died. If God gives to our souls at the last

day a new body, this cannot be called the resurrection of our body; because the word plainly implies the fresh production of what was before."

Let me here quote from our author (pages 182 and 183) so that he may face John Wesley: "The body of the resurrection is the body of which the spirit is clothed for its celestial life; the organizing life principle is uninterrupted and identical. It begins in the natural and weaves its curious integuments of dust for earthy use. It weaves the new robes for the departing soul. It will be clothed upon with a new form when the old one perishes. Give us back the person with a new body. This body of earthly matter I am perfectly willing to put off, that I may put on one that will answer the higher end of my existence better. Beyond the grave we have found that the spirit is immortal, and that it will be clothed upon with a *new* form when the *old* one perishes."

Who can look upon these two quotations face to face and not see the impassable gulf between them. John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, has the restoration of the same old body. Our author has a new body to take the place of the old one, after the old one dies; and this he has the audacity to call a resurrection. Mr. Wesley says again:

"2d. There are many places of Scripture that plainly declare it. St. Paul, in the 53d verse of this chapter, tells us that this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. Now, by this mortal and this corruptible can only be meant that body which we carry about with us, and shall

one day lay down in the dust." "The mention which the Scriptures make of the places where the dead shall rise, further shows that the same body which died shall rise." "And the very phrase of sleep and awake implies that when we rise again from the dead our bodies will be as much the same as they are when we awake from sleep." "To this we need add only that of St. Paul: The Lord shall change this vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." "Now this vile body can be no other than that with which we are now clothed, which must be restored to life again." Now read his closing exhortation: "Let this especially fortify us against the fear of death; it is now disarmed, and can do us no hurt. It divides us, indeed, from this body awhile, but it is only that we may receive it again more glorious. As God, therefore, said to Jacob: 'Fear not to go down into Egypt, for I will go down with thee, and will surely bring thee up again,' so I may say to all who are born of God, fear not to go down into the grave; lay down your heads in the dust; for God will certainly bring you up again, and that in a much more glorious manner. Only 'be ye steadfast and immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord,' and then let death prevail over and pull down this house of clay, since God hath undertaken to rear it up again, infinitely more beautiful, strong and useful."

Now let our author face this grand teaching of our founder with his rationalistic nonsense, page 31: "There are no facts which point to a return to life of

the body which is destroyed." Our author repudiates the fact of Christ's resurrection as a pattern of our resurrection. "There is not a single sign that the body will ever germinate or return to life. There is every indication that it never will. To believe that it will on any *facts* which appear, or any rational ground within our reach, is impossible." Page 23.

Here are the quotations looking each other in the face? Do they look alike? Is there any resemblance between them? I confess my inability to recognize any resemblance. If our author is orthodox, Mr. Wesley is a heretic, on this point, at least, for they are exactly contrary to each other.

Now, let us turn to Richard Watson, that wonderful theologian of the early Methodist Church, who early set Methodist doctrines in clear, terse language, like luscious fruit in baskets of polished gold, and see how our author's teaching opposes this great standard author of his own church. Mr. Watson says (page 460, vol. 2, *Institutes*): "It cannot fail to strike every impartial reader of the New Testament, that the doctrine of the resurrection is there taught without any nice distinctions. It is always exhibited as a miraculous work; and represents the same body which is laid in the grave, as the subject of this change from death unto life by the power of Christ. Thus our Lord was raised in the same body in which he died, and his resurrection is constantly held forth as the model of ours."

Here we have plain, definite statements, unmistakable, unequivocal. Our author can very easily be

compared to them, 1st. "The resurrection represents the same body which is laid in the grave, as the subject of this change from death unto life." Bishop Foster (page 179) says: "The contrast is between the body a man has before death, and the body he has after death. They are not the same, but different." Page 181: "The resurrection is the change of the earthly for the heavenly." "The body of the resurrection is the body with which the spirit is clothed for its celestial life. The spirit weaves the new (body) robes for the departing soul." Page 23: "We consign the quickly decaying form (body) to the grave." "There is not a single sign that it will ever return to life." "To believe that it will is impossible." Page 183: "Beyond the grave we have found that the spirit will be clothed upon with a *new* form (*i. e.*, body) when the old one perishes;" also, page 31, "There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed."

Mr. Watson says, 2d. "Thus our Lord was raised in the same body in which he died, and his resurrection is constantly held forth as the model of ours." Our author flatly contradicts this, page 162; "The assumption that the resurrection of Christ is a pattern of our resurrection, is wholly without foundation, and is certainly not true, and is in no sense a pattern;" further, "The fact, then, that He returned to life in the body that was crucified and buried, cannot be taken as a proof that we are so to be raised. There is proof positive that we will not."

I have set these two authors face to face; you have

your choice. I can only choose for myself. There is one thing certain, ye cannot serve God and Mammon, or two Masters. If ye choose to follow Mr. Wesley and Mr. Watson, ye must be against Bishop Foster. If ye follow our author, ye cannot hold to these Methodist authorities; and if we are to repudiate them, let us do it like our author on page 161: "The affection the soul has for the body, and the consequent disappointment it would feel at having it displaced by another, is a fond imagination—a delusion. Let us cease to be the sport of dreams and the slave of prejudice." O, ye great leaders of Methodism! O thou, John Wesley and Richard Watson, what children ye were to be the sport of dreams and slaves of prejudice! Why hold to a doctrine that has stood in the way of the acceptance of Christ and of our holy Christianity. O, ye idolatrous worshipers of an image, "fashioned in a certain way out of oxygen and other gases!" Let us cease to be the sport of childish dreams, and rise to the philosophic height of our author, and look down with disdain upon this beastly, idiotic gas machine, and cease to say, looking for the general resurrection at the last day, and saying, Who shall change our vile bodies and fashion them like unto His own glorious body by the mighty power, whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself.

Now, the question arises, Who is orthodox? not Who is right? Our author may be right, or Mr. Wesley may be right; that does not enter into the question. Our next chapter will examine that question in the

light of the Bible. Chapter III raises the question of Bishop Foster's heresy in the light of the resurrection, as taught by the Christian Church from the Apostles until now. We have found that our author is diametrically opposite to Messrs. Wesley and Watson. Now, which is orthodox? I claim, that Messrs. Wesley and Watson, our theologian and our founder, are orthodox, and it seems to me that every loyal Methodist must say, amen.

Article III of our articles of religion, declares that Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he returns to judge all men at the last day.

Bishop Foster says, page 163: "The re-living of Christ was not the putting on of immortality, and had none of the marks of resurrection, as it is to be of the saints." "Of the glorified body we know nothing, except that it is not of the fashion of his earthly body." The article of religion above quoted teaches that Christ did rise, and that he took his body and did ascend into heaven with that body. And if I see the truth, the assumption of our author makes the forty days, including the ascension, the greatest deception and fraud ever perpetrated upon our race. If Jesus did not take again this body with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, and if he did not ascend with that body, as the whole drift of the Scripture teaches, as well as Article III, then to believe in the future life is impossible; and with Justin Martyr,

A. D. 165, I ask: "Why did he (*i. e.*, Christ) rise in the flesh in which he suffered, unless to show the resurrection of the flesh."

Adam Clark says: "The creature called man is a compound being, consisting, 1st, of a body (*soma*); 2d, of a soul (*psukee*); 3d, of a spirit (*pnuma*); and that the whole man is to be preserved to the coming of Christ, that body, soul and spirit, may be then glorified forever with him."

Again, Dr. Clark says, (Notes on I Cor. 15 : 44): "It is raised a spiritual body." "One perfect in all its parts." . . . "As the seed which is sown in the earth rots, and out of the germ contained in it God in his providence produces a root, stalk, leaves, ear and a great, numerical increase of grains, is it not likely that God, out of some essential parts of the body *that now is*, will produce the resurrection body, and so completely preserve the individuality of every human being, as he does of every grain, giving to each its own body (verse 38), so that as surely as the grain of wheat shall produce wheat after it is cast into the earth, corrupts and dies, so surely shall our bodies produce the *same bodies* as to their essential individuality? As the germination of seeds is produced by *His wisdom* and *power*, so shall the pure and perfect human body be in the resurrection."

How beautiful and clear is this from the greatest, broadest, exigetical scholar Methodism has ever produced, compared with whom our modern critics and reviewers are unworthy a name. How different our author's transmigration theory: "The soul wakes

up in the future world. In its transfer, however, it loses the services of the physical senses. They have finished their function and disappear. The body which served it well can serve it no longer, and being no further useful, but a clog and shackle, will be left at the gate." How does this look in the face of Dr. Clark, John Wesley and Richard Watson? Need I quote further? If our author believes not John Wesley, Richard Watson and Adam Clark, neither would he believe if one arose from the dead and said to him, "Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side;" yea, "handle me and see; a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."

But to show further that our author is heterodox, I quote from McClintock and Strong (article "Resurrection"). Rev. Dr. John McClintock and Dr. James Strong were professors in Drew Theological Seminary, cotemporary with our author, and the above article was published the same year as "Beyond the Grave," (1879); and they apparently had in mind this very heterodoxy of their co-laborer in the faculty: "We conclude, therefore, that there is no *Scriptural, consistent* or *intelligible view*, except the one commonly entertained by Christians on this subject." This is strong. No *Scriptural, consistent, intelligible*! Now we quote further to see what is this view commonly entertained by Christians and called orthodox; and this definition would seem to have been written with "Beyond the Grave" open before them, viz: "That the pure and immaterial soul alone survives the dissolution of the body, and that at the last day

Almighty power will clothe this afresh with a corporeal frame suitable to its enlarged and completely-developed faculties, and with it glorified by some such inscrutable change as took place in our Saviour's body at the transfiguration, and as still characterized it preternaturally beheld by Saul on his way to Damascus." Now compare this closely with John Wesley (Sermons, vol. 2, p. 513): "When we have obtained the resurrection unto life, our bodies will be spiritualized, purified, and refined from their earthly grossness. Then they will be fit instruments for the soul in all its divine and heavenly employments." Here we see John Wesley, and McClintock and Strong face to face, and there is not a blush; and although a hundred years stand between them, yet their every feature harmonizes into one beautiful orthodoxy. "Not, as Plato, Origen, Swedenborg and our author would claim, some subtle and continuous *tertium quid* that emerged from the decaying substance and reconstructs a new physical home for itself."—*McClintock and Strong*. Now compare our author, page 182: "The resurrection is the standing again after death. The body of the resurrection is the body with which the spirit is clothed for its celestial life. The organizing life principle is uninterrupted and identical. It begins in the natural, and weaves its curious integuments of dust for earthly use. It weaves the new robes for the departing soul." Again, page 147: "In the change we lose our earthly bodies. We are born into new conditions, with a psychical body of some kind, which as imperceptibly develops while

we live as the body of the child unconsciously grew in the womb." Again, page 242: "When the human body is dissolved, the immaterial principle by which it was animated continues to think and act either in a state of separation from all body, or in some material vehicle to which it is ultimately united, and which goes off with it at death." Also, page 224: "But if there is the loss (at death) of the gross, physical sense, we may infer there is the acquisition of a higher order of sensorium, by which it becomes related to the spiritual realm." Also, page 183: "The spirit is immortal, and it will be clothed upon with a new form *when* the old one perishes."

Here we see Drs. McClintock and Strong's "subtle and continuous *tertium quid* that emerged from the decaying substance," &c., reconstructing its new home, palmed off as orthodoxy. This is semi-Swedenborgianism, with a mixture of transmigratism, and a little rationalism thrown in. In other words, it is heterodoxy; and it is as clear as a sunbeam that Bishop Foster, in the face of these Methodist authors, is a heretic. I might quote at great length from Methodist authors, from our origin until to-day, and they would utter but one sound; but it is not necessary that I should quote further. We are all willing to accept John Wesley, Richard Watson and Adam Clark as authority, and we all know that our author is at variance with them. He knows it, and I suppose would not deny that he does not believe in the doctrine of the resurrection as taught by them. Hence, he exhorts: "Let us cease to be the

sport of dreams and slaves of prejudice." Page 161.

We are all quite sure that Methodism is orthodox upon this fundamental doctrine. Will any one doubt or insinuate that John Wesley, Richard Watson and Adam Clark voice the sentiments of the great Methodist Church? I think not. I am sure that the great body of Methodist thinkers and writers accept these standards upon this great fundamental doctrine of the resurrection.

Is there any doubt in the mind of any that our author disagrees with them? I think not. Who is orthodox, Methodism or Bishop Foster? I say Methodism is orthodox; and can prove it, were it necessary, by quotations from every evangelical writer upon this subject from the Apostle Paul until now. Who is heretical, Methodism or Bishop Foster? I say our author is, and can prove it by quotations from the writings of heretics from Origen until Swedenborg.

Methodism joins in the chorus of the Universal Church from the Apostles until now: "I believe in the resurrection of the body." If you will consult Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," you will find this to be the united voice of the whole Christian world: "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

In the beginning, down through the 1800 years until to-day, this voices the sentiment of the whole church upon this subject with an unanimity hardly equaled on any other subject. Eastern or Western, Greek or Latin, St. Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin

or Wesley, without a dissenting voice, proclaim: "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

Let me begin with St. Paul: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" I Cor. 15:12; verse 53 explains St. Paul as to what is meant by the resurrection of the dead: "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." Not the spirit put on immortality, but "this mortal." Mr. Wesley says: "Now by this mortal and this corruptible can only be meant that body which we carry about with us, and shall one day lay down in the dust." Here we see St. Paul and Methodism agree. What will our author say to this?

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, A. D. 430, says: "But even though the body has been ground to powder by some severe accident, or by the ruthlessness of enemies; and though it has been so diligently scattered to the winds, or into the water, that there is no trace of it left, yet it shall not be beyond the Omnipotence of the Creator. No, not a hair of its head shall perish. The flesh shall then be spiritualized, and subject to the spirit, but still body, not spirit; as the spirit itself, when subject to the fleshy body, was fleshy, carnal, but still spirit, and not body flesh."—*City of God*, book 22, p. 21.

Does this teaching of the great church father agree with St. Paul, John Wesley, and Methodism, or with Bishop Foster? There is no room for doubt. This great church father but voices the sentiment of the

whole church down to his day. See Lactantius, A. D. 330; Cyprian, A. D. 258; Hippolytus, A. D., 239; Minutius Felix, A. D. 200; Tertullian, A. D. 166; Athenagoras, A. D. 117; Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 168; Justin Martyr, A. D. 165; Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, A. D. 69; Polycarp, Ignatius. I need not quote from these. Those who wish may consult them, and they will find that Augustine, in 430 A. D., agrees with them all in this article of the Christian faith. I cannot forbear quoting from Justin Martyr in order to show how clear and explicit the resurrection of the body was taught, and that you may see how baldly our author is in conflict with these mighty men of God and the church. He writes against the heathen in defense of the faith: "And what is most forcible of all, he raised the dead—why? Was it not to show what the resurrection should be? How then did he raise the dead? Their souls or their bodies? Manifestly both. If the resurrection were only spiritual, it was requisite that he, in raising the dead, should show the body lying apart by itself, and the soul lying apart by itself. But now he did not do so, but raised the body, confirming in it the promise of life. Why did he rise in the flesh in which he suffered, unless to show the resurrection of the flesh." I feel my cheek burn to even write a quotation from our author in the face of this great church father and early martyr. Page 182, "This body of earthy matter I am perfectly willing to put off, that I may put on one that will answer the higher ends of my existence better." "Will be

clothed upon with a new form when the old one perishes;" also, 161, "The affection the soul has for the body, is a fond imagination." Page 256, "The animal (the body) which served it well, can serve it no longer; will have led the immortal (the spirit) to the door of heaven, into which it cannot go; and being no further useful, but a clog and a shackle, will be left at the gate." Oh, spirits of Augustine and Justin Martyr, how canst thou be quiet!

I think to quote from a few of the great creeds of the Christian Church will be sufficient to show that Methodism; and not our author, is orthodox. The Heidelberg Catechism, A. D. 1563, German Reformed Church: *Ques.* "What comfort does the resurrection of the body afford thee? *Ans.* That not only my soul, after this life, shall be immediately taken up to Christ, its Head, but also that this my body, raised by the power of Christ, shall again be united with my soul and made like unto the glorious body of Christ." Confession of the Eastern Church, A. D. 1643: *Ques.* cxx. "What is the eleventh article of the faith? *Ans.* I look for the resurrection of the dead." This our author would claim to answer likewise; but the difference is seen in the next question and answer. *Ques.* cxxi. "What does the article of faith teach? *Ans.* It teaches positively and with perfect truth, that there will be a resurrection of *human bodies*, alike of the righteous and the wicked, *from the death* that has passed upon them. . . . They shall be *altogether the same bodies with which they have lived in this world.*"

Here again we see our author, and not Methodism, is heterodox.

Our author is not the first heretic that has arisen on this subject; as early as 215 A. D., Titus Flavius Clemens, taught this same heresy, substituting Platonism, or the soul's independence of the body with its power to provide itself a new body when the old one was dead. From this Origen drank his poison that made him a heretic upon the same subject. All along the ages this same heresy may be seen cropping out, but until to-day it has never been able to exert much influence against the overwhelming and almost unanimous teaching of Christian men and scholars; and I hope as in the past there may be enough of the spirit of our fathers in us to defend the old doctrine against the rationalizing tendencies of this age.

Here I consent to rest the argument of our author's heresy in the light of the resurrection, as taught by the Christian Church from the Apostles until now. I am entirely satisfied that no thoughtful person can read this chapter, and look into the authorities quoted, without deciding as I have; no matter whether he think with me or with our author. This will be conceded, and it is all I ask. I believe this heresy to be an insidious poison. I believe the church is right, and our author wrong. I believe one of the distinctive and fundamental doctrines of our Holy Christianity is in danger. I am concerned. I am in earnest. I cannot be still. We have fallen on dangerous times; the infidelity to be feared to-day is not coarse and blatant,

but a cultured, intellectual rationalism, that would do away with all the distinctive features of our holy religion—a rationalistic, Unitarian, Universalistic, Swedenborgian *cultus*. The fall, the new birth, hell, the resurrection and the judgment, are all swept into the region of a superstitious past, to be ignored; and we are urged to cease to be the sport of dreams and prejudice. I am sorry and sick at heart, that in the Methodist Church, among our leading ministers, should be found defenders of such rationalizing tendencies. I am sorry that our author, one that I love so well, one that the church has honored and revered so long, should be found among this list. I am sorry that the enemies of grand, old, sound orthodoxy can number in their ranks one who has such ability, influence and opportunity to help them and to hurt us. I am sorry that a Bishop of the Methodist Church should so far forget his great responsibility as to consent to allow the weight of his name, age, piety and position to be subverted to so unworthy a task. O, Lord, deliver us from the pernicious influence of "Beyond the Grave."

CHAPTER IV..

BISHOP FOSTER'S HERESY IN THE LIGHT OF THE RESURRECTION AS TAUGHT BY THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth;" Jesus.—John 5: 28–29.

"We consign the quickly decaying form to the grave. . . . There is not a single sign that it will ever return to life. To believe that it will is impossible."—"Beyond the Grave," p. 23.

"For the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised."—I Cor. 15: 52.

"For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised?"—I Cor. 15: 16.

"There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed."—"Beyond the Grave," pp. 31 and 32.

Is comment necessary? What is in the graves? What shall hear? What shall come forth? What dead shall be raised? What meaneth the Lord Jesus Christ and St. Paul? What shall not return to life? What has no sign of returning life? What has no fact that points to a return to life? What meaneth our author?

Can there be a shadow of doubt as to the meaning of either of these authors? Here they stand face to face. Christ and Paul declare that the grave shall give up the dead, and the dead shall live. Our author declares: "The grave shall not give up, and that the dead shall not live."

Need I say that this is appalling, for a Christian philosopher thus to diametrically oppose his own rationalism to the plain declarations of Holy Writ? Some may say that our author doesn't mean to oppose the Master; but I can't help what he means. I only show what he does, and that without a particle of overdrawn conclusions, and by simple and direct quotations, which are in the spirit of both of their teachings. The Scriptures declare from end to end by the whole trend of their teaching, as well as by clear, definite, positive precept, that the dead live again. The same body rises again. The grave shall give up. Our author declares again and again, positively and clearly: "The dead body lives not again. The grave does not give up its prey."

I have shown in Chapter III that I am sustained by the whole church in this view of Scripture teaching. I have shown again and again that our author opposes this whole teaching of revelation. Now let me further show our author's heresy by quoting from Scripture:

FIRST PROPHECY.

The first promise to our fallen, federal head: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head."
"For since by man came death, by man came also the

resurrection of the dead." "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Death came to Adam by sin (our author to the contrary, notwithstanding). 1st, Spiritual death; 2d, Physical death, and of necessity the grave followed. Had he not sinned he would have lived in communion with God until his probation ended, and then been translated, and death and the grave would have been unknown. "Now, since by man (Adam) came death, by man (Christ) came also the resurrection of the dead."

(2) Job 19: 25-27, says: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day (not the last day, as some suppose) upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my *oomibbeshare* (*humanity, full body and soul*) shall I see God."

Job did not say in my flesh, as meaning a corruptible, dying, mortal nature, but after this corruption takes place; yet, through his Redeemer, he by faith received the real resurrection of his unique human nature. O, glorious faith! Equal to my mind to that of Abraham, when on Mount Moriah he was enabled by faith in the promise of God to slay his son, receiving him back through the resurrection from the ashes.

(3) David in Psalm 16: 10: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

Let Peter, on that memorable occasion, the Pentecost, speak to you of David's faith. Acts 2:25-36:

“Men and brethren, let me freely speak of the patriarch David, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. He, seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.”

St. Paul, in Acts 13:32-37, also so beautifully calls attention: “And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us, his children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm.” He also refers to the 16th Psalm. These inspired references by Peter and Paul warrant us in claiming David as teaching, with Job, the grand old doctrine of the resurrection of the body; and the resurrection of Christ on the third day was the fulfilled hope and promise to God’s ancient servants, and declared to be so by St. Peter and St. Paul. I need only to quote a few more of the ancient prophecies:

See Isa. 25:8: “He will swallow up death in victory.” 26:19: “Thy dead men shall live: together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for the earth shall cast out the dead.” If there is any resurrection taught here, it is of the body that was dead and in the grave. Eze. 37:11-14: “O, my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves.” Hos. 13:14: “I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O, death,

I will be thy plagues; O, grave, I will be thy destruction." Hos. 6:2: "After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight."

I have already quoted St. Peter and St. Paul, to show the interpretation of David's prophecy; I now simply call attention to Christ's and St. Paul's injunction. Christ, to the disciples, on the way to Emmaus, after they had told him of the disappointment at Christ's death and suffering, and the rumored resurrection, said, Luke 24:25: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken; ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" St. Paul, in I Cor. 15:4: "He was buried, and he arose again the third day, according to the Scriptures." What Scriptures, if not the ones I have quoted. Again St. Paul says, Heb. 11:35, when speaking of those prophets and early heroes: "They were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection." But they "obtained not the promise, God having provided that they should not be made perfect without us." And in harmony with this whole teaching of the Old Scriptures Christ prophesied: "Destroy this body and in three days I will raise it up." Also St. Paul exclaims in almost exact language with Hosea: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory."

Enoch was translated, that he should not see death. Elijah was carried to heaven in a chariot of fire. Not only as clear prophecies of the resurrection

of the whole man, but as an ocular demonstration to the ages and dispensations in which they lived.

Yet, in the face of these prophecies and facts, our author claims (p. 258 "Beyond the Grave"): "Where life was supreme, death holds undisputed sway. There is not, and never has been, an exception to this in the realm of terrestrial life." Also, p. 147: "In the change (*i. e.*, death) we lose our earthly bodies."

But when we come to the New Testament, the glaring inconsistency and heresy of our author becomes still more apparent. The Jews asked a sign. Jesus said: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."—Matt. 12: 40. Again, the Jews ask a sign. Jesus said: "Destroy this body, and in three days I will raise it up."—John 2: 19. Now let us carefully read St. Luke, chapter 23, verse 46: "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit. And having said this, he gave up the ghost." Also, verses 50-53: "Joseph went unto Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. And he took it down and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid." Now read also 24: 1-7: "And they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And the angel said: 'He is not here, but is risen, as He said He would on the third day.'"

I quote these words that I may bring our author face to face with this great central fact of our Holy Christianity. Page 23: "There is not a single sign

that it (the body) will ever return to life. To believe that it will, on any facts which appear on any rational ground within our reach, is impossible." Page 24: "For ages the world has been waiting and watching; millions, with broken hearts, have hovered around the yawning abyss; but no echo has come back from the engulfing gloom—silence, oblivion, covers all." Now let me ask what about the fact quoted from St. Luke of the death, burial and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ who has become the first fruits and pledge of our resurrection? We weep not as them who have no hope. "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable; but now is Christ risen from the dead?"—I Cor. 15: 19. Our author here puts himself back to the same position with Plato and Pythagoras. He forever loses the demonstration made by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, by which he brought life and immortality to light, which is not brought to light unless the same body raised was glorified. He says, page 23: "Until we see that the corrupting clod (body), however dear to us, is not the person we so fondly loved, hope even is impossible; much more, rational belief. [What about Mr. Wesley's hope? Is hope impossible, now? Was Mr. Wesley's belief irrational?] If it is only the house that is in ruins, there is a possible chance for the thought that, maybe, the overthrow is not utter and irretrievable." *Now*, as before the resurrection of Jesus, that "possible chance" can only be a speculation as open to the ancients as to us. The resurrection of Jesus is the

only basal fact on which any rational, comforting hope can rest; and that resurrection is the resurrection of the body, which our author, with the ancients, chooses to call a "*corrupting clod*." And if we choose to believe with our author that "there is not a single sign that it will ever return to life, and no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed," we must consign ourselves and our theology, and our race, to the same "misgivings, doubts and fears" as the heathen, and hope must take its everlasting flight from the grave of our friend.

Let us pause a moment. If, as our author says above, page 23: "Until we see that the corrupting clod, however dear to us, is not the person," &c., why has the Scriptures left us so entirely ignorant of that fact? If the only possible chance that our overthrow is not complete by death lies in the demonstration that it is not the body that survives, why such explicit teaching, by precept and example, that it is the body that is restored to life. "Destroy this body, and in three days I will raise it up again." Why was not this necessity felt by Christ and the Apostles, and the church ever since? How comes it that our author is so wise above what is written? Look at the whole fact of Christ's resurrection and ascension, and where is there an intimation that can be with any propriety construed to mean anything like this? If not here, where? Is not this the foundation of all our hope? Is not this fact, the fact to which Paul and the church turned, as the only fact for hope of the resurrection? If it is necessary now, as our author

claims, why not then, and if then, why did not Christ and St. Paul feel that necessity, as our author evidently does. It would have been an easy matter after his death to have appeared to them, as he did after the ascension to John, Stephen, and Paul. He could have ignored and despised the corrupting clod; or even at the ascension he could have left the body to the disciples and said, I am not my body, I am a spirit. This body can't go up to heaven. I am now about to receive my new body; but so far as we know he did just the opposite. "I am not a spirit." "Handle me and see." His last blessing was given with uplifted hands, and there is not an intimation that they were not the same pierced hands that were offered to Thomas to confirm his wavering faith, and he now appears in his exalted position as a slain lamb, and with Wesley, the church has sung:

"Five bleeding wounds he bear,
Received on Calvary;
They pour effectual prayer,
They strongly plead for me."

No, no; our author is chasing a phantom, and his theory must be condemned as an unsustained hobgoblin. By further quotations you will see that he makes here a fundamental stand.

Here is the crucial test; page 31, "Beyond the Grave," our author says: "There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed. We must be able, therefore, to show that what you see

is not the man, or abandon all idea of his immortality on rational grounds."

Let us notice this sweeping assertion in two parts:

First, "There are no facts," &c. Now what can our author mean by this?

1st. If he means that nature or experience gives us no facts, we concede the point. While nature gives us many prophecies or illustrations that would inspire hope, such as the butterfly coming forth from the grave of the chrysalis; spring coming forth from the grave of winter, &c.; also in experience such as the awakening to consciousness from the grave of slumber; the return to consciousness from the grave of fever and other diseases, like Bishop Foss and Rev. William Tennent, of the Presbyterian Church of Freehold, New Jersey; we do not claim these as facts that point to the return to life of the dead body. But we do claim that it is reasonable to believe that the God of all nature can restore to life the body of man as the dead and rotted grain. And the parable of the Saviour, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die," John 12:24; and also used by St. Paul to illustrate this very subject, I Cor. 15:35-38: "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." So while we don't claim "any fact in nature or experience that points to a return to life of the body which is destroyed," yet we do claim that whatever of hope or comfort there is in these things, comes from their illustrating to our minds the possibility of the resurrection of our material nature, and that there is not one iota of illustration of life out of the material

body. The butterfly, on gauzy wing, floating amid Eden bowers, sipping the nectar from velvet lips, is but the resurrected worm that crept beneath our feet on the cold earth, and gnawed the unsavory wormwood and the gall. The rising plant, young, tender, beautiful, shaking off its old corrupting clod, rises only in the image of its ancestor clod; and the only fact that we can force from these illustrations is the return to life of our material bodies, if anything. If these things fail to "point to a return to life of the dead body or material nature," as our author claims, they are of no use to him to prove that man lives beyond this life. We claim that these facts in nature and experience are helpful to our faith only.

2d. If he means to say by the assertion that "there are no facts," &c., that the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is not a fact, then we demur. And here is the secret point of his trouble. The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead in the body that was laid in the grave, is the fact that strikes the death knell to his whole system. Hence his effort (to me dreadful), pages 163-165, to prove this great central, basal fact of our Holy Christianity was not a fact. He tries to show that what we have understood to be the resurrection fact, is not the resurrection fact. He says: "The fact, then, that He returned to life in the body that was crucified and buried, cannot be taken as proof that we are so to be raised. His resurrection to natural life no more illustrates the doctrine of the immortal life than would the resuscitation of a neighbor of ours by a miracle, &c. . . . The

resurrection of Christ was not the putting on of immortality. On one occasion, in fact, He, in effect, declares that He had not entered the resurrection state." The angel, however, said: "He is not here; He is risen." Peter, James, John and the women said He had risen. St. Paul, who never saw Him till after the ascension, says (I Cor. 15:3): "For I delivered unto you first of all that what I also received," &c.; "and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve," &c.; "and last of all He was seen of me also." Now we see what our author means by his sweeping assertion, "There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed." He not only sweeps away every prophecy in nature and experience, but he destroys by one stroke the "fact of Christ's resurrection as a proof of the resurrection of the dead."

Now I ask, that if the resurrection of Jesus Christ is not a fact that points to a return to life of the body which is destroyed, what kind of a fact is it? Yes, what kind of a fact is it? With Justin Martyr, A. D. 165, I ask: "Why did he rise in the body in which he suffered, unless to show the resurrection of the body? If the resurrection were only spiritual, it was requisite that He, in raising the dead, should show the body lying apart by itself, and the soul lying apart by itself. But now He did not do so, but raised the body, confirming in it the promise of life." "Frag. Res." chap. ix. "Apol." ii.

Is it possible that this great fact is not a fact? I an-

swer, ten thousand times, No! Our author, infatuated by a dream of his philosophy, carries his sophistries so far that he would overthrow the very foundations of our Holy Christianity. If he is right here, our hopes are vain, our preaching is vain, we are yet in our sins. But, thank God, he is beside himself. For now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept. Christ arose from the dead in the flesh that saw no corruption. He walked and talked and appeared unto many for forty days. He lived not by a natural life, but by the power of an endless life. "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." "I am He that was dead, and am alive forevermore," and have the keys of death. How or when that body was glorified, we agree with Foster that we don't know. On the Mount of Transfiguration, He was once glorified before His death. When or where after the resurrection we are not told; but *as it was the same body glorified on the Mount of Transfiguration, so it was the same body that was raised from the grave, that was glorified and ascended to heaven; and the promise is that this same Jesus shall come again.*

If Jesus did not ascend to heaven in the same body that was raised from the grave and was quickened into life, what body did He ascend in? From whence came it? What became of the old body that was crucified, dead and buried, and arose on the third day? Did it fall over the brow of Olivet's mount? Did it collapse like a balloon, and its elements separate into the original dust?

What becomes of the fact of the resurrection, if it does not point to the return of the body to life? What of its significance? It would be naturally and wholly misleading, if somehow or other, after forty days of effort to convince the world of His power over death and the grave by many demonstrations that the dead was alive, He manages to slip out of the old corruptible clod and gets away without detection. What becomes of this great fact? What becomes of the testimony of those forty days? Did Christ let them know where His second grave was? If not, why not? If they did know, why did they not tell us? Where is the deception? If the body that was raised did not rise to demonstrate His power over death and the grave concerning the body, if the resurrection fact does not point to the return of the body to immortal life after death, what did it signify to the Jews and to the world, for nearly all men have believed in the life of the soul after death? It did not need a bodily resurrection to demonstrate that to the world. Where is the significance of the fact? Come with me out to Olivet. The Saviour and the eleven walk and talk together. They know that He is risen from the dead; even Thomas believes now. "Lord will thou at this time restore Israel." He spreads those pierced hands in blessing on their heads. Thomas, are those the hands that He showed thee in that upper room? Peter, James and John, is that the same Jesus you have been with for more than three years—on the sea! on the mountain! in the wilderness? Was that brow crowned in Pilate's hall? Were

those feet and hands nailed to the cross? Was that side pierced by the soldier's spear? Are you sure that He is the same one you have followed? See, He rises higher and higher, higher and higher. Is it He still? What arose, the body or soul? "Why stand ye gazing up into heaven, ye men of Galilee"—Thomas, James and John? "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."

St. Paul seems to understand this same Jesus, body as well as soul, to have ascended. Heb. 9: 12: "By his own blood He entered in once into the holy place." Verse 24: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself now, to appear in the presence of God for us." Also, chap. 10, v. 5: "But a body hast thou prepared me." Also, verse 10: "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Verse 12: "But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God."

John on Patmos saw Jesus after he had seen Him rise from Olivet; and although very glorious, I suppose equal, if not far transcending, the glory of the Transfiguration, yet he recognized him at least as one like unto the Son of Man. But to put cavil out of the question, Jesus declares himself: "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore." Now, I ask, if his body was not dead, what was? The spirit returned to God, and no one would claim that *it* was dead. Now, if the body that Thomas

saw and was convinced by was thrown over the brow of Olivet, and did not ascend, what was dead and made alive again? If, as our author says, page 165, "His glorified humanity was assumed at or after the scene on Olivet," was that assumed body a dead body or a living body? If a living body, had it been dead and brought to life? or how did Jesus say, I was dead? If he assumed a dead body at or after Olivet, where did he find that dead carcass? Was it a dead body of a saint or a sinner?

If this glorified being whom John recognized as the Son of Man, and who declared, "I am He that liveth and was dead," was not the same material body that suffered, groaned, died, and was buried, rose again and ascended to the Father, how could he say, "I am He that liveth and was dead?"

Our author has the candor to state, page 165, "That no historian has given any account of it." Then why has he the audacity to assume what makes the demonstrations of the forty days, and the plain teaching of the eye-witnesses of the scene of Olivet, deceptive? If, as our author states, he assumed it "at the scene of Olivet," why did not the witnesses declare it? If "he assumed it after the scene of Olivet," why did Christ allow the deception? If, as our author says, page 166, "We shall be changed, not like unto the body of the post-resurrection history while he yet tarried among us, but like unto the body He received amid the splendor of the Olivet scene, when the earthly was *exchanged* for the heavenly," why has no historian told us about such *exchange*? Why does

the historian talk about a *change* instead of an *exchange*? Why does St. Paul say (I Cor. 15 : 51): "Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be *changed*;" also, verse 52: In a moment "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be *changed*;" Phil. 3 : 21 : "Who shall *change* our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body"?

Now, why doesn't this inspired author talk like our author? Why does he not say this vile earthly body shall be exchanged for the heavenly body? Why should there be this difference? Manifestly because our author believes this earthly body shall be exchanged for a something else. This old body is left at the door. It can go no further. The spirit is clothed upon with a new body when the old one dies. St. Paul believed that the dead should be raised incorruptible, and the living should be changed in a moment, *i. e.*, the old body should not be exchanged, but changed. This vile body shall be changed, not exchanged. The change is in the vile body; it shall receive the change, not laid aside for another, a new one. It shall be made in the change like his glorious body. Here is the secret spring of the whole error, only a little prefix, *ex*. To confound these two simple distinctions is to confuse the simplest laws of our language, beside confounding the ever-distinct subjects of the resurrection of the body and that of its glorification by the power of God.

Dr. Adam Clark, on II Tim. 1 : 10, very forcefully contradicts our author: "He took the same human

body up into heaven, in the sight of his disciples; and ever appears in the presence of God for us; and thus has illustrated the doctrine of incorruption. In his death, resurrection and ascension, the doctrine of eternal life, and the resurrection of the human body, and its final incorruptibility, are fully illustrated by example, and established by fact." And yet our author persists in saying, page 31, "There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed;" and I have shown that the fact of the resurrection of Christ's body is included by our author, and we are left in the same category of the ancients with only misgivings, doubts and fears, and with our author must "abandon all idea of his immortality on rational grounds," page 32. This leads us to Part II.

Our author, as quoted above, says, since there is no fact which points to the return to life of the body which is destroyed, therefore we must be able to show that what you see is not the man, or abandon all idea of his immortality on rational grounds. I answer,

1st. We have shown that there are prophetic facts in nature and experience that point to the return to life of the body which is destroyed.

2d. We have shown that the resurrection of Christ not only points to the return of the body to life, but that it demonstrates beyond the possibility of a doubt, by well authenticated, indubitable evidence, the greatest fact of history, that the body of Christ did return to life; that the grave did give up its dead, and He that was dead rose to die no more, and was changed into ineffable and eternal glory; and that our author's

attempt to break down this great fact is a miserable failure.

If there is any fact in the whole realm of facts fully established beyond the shadow of a doubt to the Christian, it is the fact that one dead body committed to the grave did return to life; did come forth from the sealed tomb, and that it lived and walked with men, fully establishing its identity, and in the presence of eleven worthy witnesses ascended in broad daylight to heaven. To deny, or to throw suspicion upon this fact, worthy of all acceptance, is a business of which none but the most abandoned should be capable; and how our author should have been led to lend the weight of his pen to weaken the conviction of this the greatest fact, and the most fundamental fact of our Holy Christianity, I cannot understand. Now, notice, our author demands that we must be able to show that what we see (*i. e.*, the body) is not the man, or abandon all idea of rational immortality.

I answer, 1st, I have shown in Chapters I and II, that man is a compound being, consisting of body, soul and spirit; and that while the body is not the man, neither is the spirit the man.

I answer, 2d, That if we must prove that what we see (*i. e.*, the body of material nature) is not the man or the part essential to his future happiness, we are divested of our strongest comfort, because we have no possibility of investigating or knowing of the existence of man as a spirit; and with Dr. Munsell I say: "A science of pure spirit, were it possible to man, would be wholly of speculative value." Hence

our author sweeps away all practical facts, and all possible hope on rational grounds, and throws us back to the guessing of the ancients. And if, as he says, page 163, "The fact, then, that He (Christ) returned to life in the body that was crucified and buried, cannot be taken as proof that we are so to be raised," then there is no proof of a future life, and we are of all men most miserable. "Now, if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? but if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. . . . Whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your preaching is vain; ye are yet in your sins."—I Cor. 15:12-17. O, sad wailing of human hearts! "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." "But, thank God, now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept."—Paul.

Now let us briefly, in conclusion, show by quoting without note or comment some teaching from our author and the Scriptures.

However, let us bear in mind the fundamental difference between our author and the Scriptures. We have already seen that he teaches that the man is a spirit. The body is no part of the man. The spirit is an immaterial, immutable, incorruptible substance, like God, an angel. The body is material, beastly, idiotic, dying, a corruptible clod.

The body at death returns to the dust, never to live

again ; it can never return to life ; a resurrection here is impossible.

The spirit leaves this body never to return again. They can never be reunited. It, that is, the man, the spirit, lives on. It doesn't die. It doesn't enter the grave. It goes to God, enters heaven, the abode of spirits, is a pure spirit, mingles with spirits, is free forever from its cage, its former body. It emerges at death from the old shell. It may be clothed upon with a psychical body of some kind. What this psychical nondescript is, we are not told ; where it comes from we are left to guess ; except it (*i. e.*, the spirit) weaves for itself a new robe.

Now, where is the resurrection ? The body never rises. The spirit never dies.

The Scriptures teach emphatically that the spirit never dies, it cannot have a resurrection from the dead. They teach that the dead shall live again. They teach that death itself, even, shall be conquered. They teach that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust. They teach that the body shall be raised, and that the soul and the body of the wicked shall be cast into hell. They teach that the grave and even the sea shall give up their dead. Paul declares the dead (not the living) shall be raised, and we shall be changed. In the light of these two teachings let us quote from the two authorities.

"Beyond the Grave," page 23, "We consign the quickly decaying form to the grave. We know that it soon moulders to dust. There is not a single sign that it will ever germinate or return to life. To believe

that it will on any rational ground within our reach is impossible."

Jesus, in John 5:28-29, "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

St. Paul, 1 Cor. 15:36, "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Verse 52, "And the dead shall be raised." Also 1 Thess. 4:16, "And the dead in Christ shall rise first."

John 19:33, 34, "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that He was dead already, they break not His legs: but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." Verse 40, "Then took they the body of Jesus and wound it in fine linen clothes with the spices." Matt. 27:58-66: "He went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth and laid it in his own new tomb, and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre," &c.

Next chapter, verses 5 and 6: "And the angel said, He is not here, for He is risen, as He said; come, see the place where the Lord lay." Luke 24:46-51: "And said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and ye are witnesses of these things. And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He was

parted from them and carried up into heaven." Matt. 27:52, 53: "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many." John 11:39-44: "Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto him, Lord, by this time he stinketh, for he had been dead four days." . . . "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth; and he that was dead came forth." Rev. 20:12, 13: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God. . . . And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell (Hades) delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged, every man according to their works." Acts 17:31: "Whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him (Jesus) from the dead."

Beyond the Grave, 256: "The animal, which served it well, can serve it no longer; will have accomplished its mediatorial purpose; will have led the immortal to the door of his heaven, into which it cannot go; and being no further useful, but a clog and shackle, will be left at the gate." Also page 147: "In the change we lose our earthly bodies, and all conditions of the life we lived in them, which we have outgrown, the ends of which have been served. We are born into new conditions, with a psychical body of some kind, which as imperceptibly develops while we live as the body of the child unconsciously grew in the womb." Again, page 182-3: "The resurrection is the standing

again after death. The body of the resurrection is the body with which the spirit is clothed for its celestial life. The organizing life principle is uninterrupted and identical. It begins in the natural, and weaves its curious integuments of dust for earthly use ; it weaves the new robes for the departing soul. . . . I wish to put on record here that, for myself, there is nothing in any particle of flesh or blood that ever belonged to my body that creates in me a least desire to ever see it again. Beyond the grave we have found that the spirit is immortal, and that it will be clothed upon with a new form when the old one perishes." Matt. 10:28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Gehenna). I Cor. 15:12-20: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the *dead*, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead; but if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen," &c. Acts 1:9, 22: "While they beheld He was taken up." "To be a witness with us of his resurrection."

Swedenborg is the only witness we know of that ever saw the resurrection taught by our author. Acts 24:15: "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." I Cor. 15:51: "Behold I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep (*die*), but we shall all be changed (not die and rot) in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be *changed*,"

not exchanged for a psychical nonsense. "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

John Wesley says: "Now by this mortal and this corruptible can only be meant that body which we carry about with us, and shall one day lay down in the dust." And with the creed of the Christian church, "I believe in Jesus Christ who suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; that He rose again the third day; that he ascended into heaven." And with St. John I expect to see him in all his glorified humanity. Rev. 1:13-17: "And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and His hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and His eyes were as a flame of fire; and His feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and His voice as the sound of many waters. His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." And with John I expect to fall at his feet overcome with the grandeur of His resurrection glory; and glory to his name, I shall feel his own kind hand upon me, and hear Him say: "Fear not, I am the first and the last; I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore."

CHAPTER V.

BISHOP FOSTER'S HERESY COMPARED WITH OTHER HERESIES, "PELAGIANISM" AND "SWEDENBORGIANISM."

Our author's false premise, "Man is a spirit," leads him inevitably into the errors of Pelagianism as to the origin of death to man, and consequently into the errors of Pelagianism and of Swedenborgianism as to the resurrection of the human body. Notice,

FIRST, HIS PELAGIANISM.

The *first* charge against Pelagianism was that it taught "That Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he sinned or not." See McClintock and Strong, Art. Pelagianism. Jensen and Garnier "maintain that this first tenet is the root of the whole system of Pelagianism," which we think could be readily maintained. However this may or may not be, our author's "Spirit Man," and "Animal Body" leads inevitably into this same error essentially. And he had no need to add Note B. in his appendix in "Beyond the Grave" to make it clear; but since he has, we will quote from it to convict him from his own pen. Far be it from us to charge our

author with holding to all of the heresy of Pelagianism; but his system has the root; and given the same soil and atmosphere of Pelagius, it would lead to the same results; and so far as the resurrection is concerned it inevitably leads to the fourth charge against Pelagianism, viz: "That since neither by the death nor transgression of Adam the whole race dies, so neither will the whole human race rise again from the dead on account of Christ's resurrection."

I admit that our author tries to evade his true teaching by some admissions about the tree of life; but like his resurrection it is only an evasion, only a little side current, while his whole channel sweeps on to the inevitable. Man is a spirit. The body is purely animal. Death is its natural terminus. Let us quote "Beyond the Grave," page 243: "We are free to confess that we can see nothing in the nature of man to exempt him from the common law of death so far forth as he is animal. Further, we are constrained to believe, that, left to the mere working of natural law, he would have died. He most certainly included in his created constitution tendencies to death. The same causes that work dissolution in other creatures were active in his nature. As to his organic life *he was naturally mortal.*" Here is expressed our author's true idea of man's physical nature. It is in keeping with the whole theory of his "spirit man" and "body machine." Page 247 he says: "His real self is spirit, not body." "The scaffolding which is necessary to the building, while it is in process of erection, becomes a deformity," &c. "The egg which nourishes and pro-

fects the young bird while it is preparing for its life of freedom in the outer air would smother and destroy it if continued but a little too long. The expanding germ could not long live," &c. "In the case of man there is abundant evidence that he does, in an incredibly brief period, grow beyond his present appointments," &c. "The organism, the animal, in which the man, the spirit—the true and only self—comes swathed, answers the double purpose for a time, but it soon becomes an incumbrance," &c. "There is nothing that pertains to a body . . . that would be agreeable to carry up through eternity," &c. Nor is this fact of growing disharmony with its earthly conditions attributable to the accident of sin, or any abnormal effects arising therefrom. "Had man remained forever innocent, &c., death entered into the very essence of the economy. The babe in the womb, the bird in the shell," &c., are not more obvious cases of incipient and preliminary stages of life having reference to a more advanced stage than is the present condition of man. "The ultimate for man as the highest and grandest thing possible to his nature—the culmination and completeness of his being—is spiritual perfection." "At first bodies are necessary," page 253. "The animal which served it well, can serve it no longer; will have accomplished its mediatorial purpose; will have led the immortal to the door of his heaven, into which it cannot go; and being no further useful, but a clog and shackle, will be left at the gate."—"Beyond the Grave," page 256.

Pages 258 and 259: "Where life was supreme, death

holds undisputed sway. There is not, and never has been, an exception to this in the realm of terrestrial life. All things that have a material life live through a cycle—it may be a minute, it may be a thousand years—and die ; die because that for which they lived has been accomplished. Life is a transient and transitive force. Thus it appears, from the nature of the life acting in and through matter, that death is its normal terminus *ad quem*. Nothing short of eternal miracle, set for the guardianship of each life, could guarantee its deathless continuance.”

Now let me quote the first and fourth charge against Pelagianism:

Charge 1st. “That Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he sinned or not.” Our author, page 251, says: “Death entered into the very essence of the economy.” “Nor is this fact of growing disharmony with its earthly conditions attributable to the accident of its sin.”—Page 249. “Sin, which entered the world by one man is new, while death is ancient. The cause cannot be subsequent to the effect.”—Page 268. Can anyone doubt the truthfulness of the charge, that our author is guilty of this first charge: Adam was created mortal, and that sin did not bring in death? And if the first charge is sustained the fourth follows as a natural sequence, viz: “Since neither by the death nor transgression of Adam the whole race dies, so neither will the whole human race rise again from the dead.” I can only refer the reader to our author’s oft-repeated assertions, “There are no facts which point to a return to life of

the body which is destroyed. There is every indication that it never will; to believe that it will is impossible," &c., &c. These prove conclusively that our author is in full sympathy with Pelagianism so far as these two charges are concerned.

Now, if we may diverge a moment, let us ask, What will our author do with his "Tree of life sacrament?" page 244. If we allow any force to his digression, as on page 243: "And yet we accept the idea that had he not sinned he would not have died; the naturally mortal as to his organic life would have been, by special supernatural interference, made immortal;" *i. e.*, as on page 259, "An *eternal miracle* set for the guardianship of each life could guarantee its deathless continuance." Also, page 245, "This immunity was not of nature, but of grace."

Now let us ask, If the "real self is spirit, not body;" if this body which is necessary at first soon becomes an insupportable burden; if there is nothing that pertains to this body that would be agreeable to carry up through eternity, why, we ask, was the tree of life inflicted upon Adam in the Garden of Eden? Why should it, that is, the body, be kept alive by an eternal miracle? Why keep the babe in the womb, the bird in the shell, the germ in the seed, until it (*i. e.*, the body) becomes, not only an insupportable burden, but finally destroys the babe, the bird, the germ, yea, the spirit-man. Hence, we see that death was not only natural, but necessary to the life of the spirit. Now, if our author would admit that man was created immortal, and that the tree of life, like the tree of the

knowledge of good and evil, was but an outward sign of an inward fact; that man was alive by his nature, and the tree of life was but an outward and visible sign of that fact, like the Lord's supper, and the tree of good and evil the outward sign or test of obedience, then the tree of life would answer a purpose; but if man was naturally mortal, and immortality in a body was undesirable, and death desirable as well as natural, then the tree of life would only be a standing menace to what was desirable. If "death," as our author claims, page 251, "entered into the very essence of the economy;" if death is born of creation, not of retribution; if it is God's offspring direct, not a penal device; if it exists in the bosom of sinless, not merely sinning nature, why, we ask, was the tree of life allowable in the garden? and why does our author advert to it, except as a side show to cover up an apparent discrepancy in his system? If Adam had not sinned, should he have been compelled to carry the burdensome body forever? Then we see a new excuse for his sin.

Now, if our author will allow, we will suggest that Adam was created immortal, in the image of God. The tree of life was appointed as a sacrament of which he was to eat in grateful, loving obedience. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was forbidden also as a standing sacrament not to be eaten. If he had not sinned he would have remained immortal, for the threatening was death if he ate of the forbidden tree. On his obedience or disobedience his existence hung, and that existence was of the body, as well as the

happiness of the spirit. In that immortality he would have lived on earth until the walking and communing with God so filled him with God that the body would have been so spiritualized and glorified that, like Enoch rising from this lower sphere, he would have passed, soul, body and spirit, into the inner glory, into the New Jerusalem, that hath foundations; and that not by an eternal miracle but by the natural, inborn, undying nature, of which Enoch and Elijah were but miraculous examples to speak to a sin-cursed world of the better hope in Jesus Christ, the world's Redeemer, and inspired the ages to look for that better resurrection so long foretold.

Even an unbelieving scientist like Herbert Spencer can show this scientifically proper, for he says (page 88, *Principles of Biology*): "Perfect correspondence would be perfect life. Were there no changes in the environment but such as the organism had adapted changes to meet, and were it never to fail in the efficiency with which it met them, there would be eternal existence." Now, if this be a scientific truth, how easy for a Christian believer to see unsinning man, fresh and pure from the Creator's hands in an uncursed world, with the tree of life as a sacrament, to have this "perfect correspondence." And is it not rational to believe that this exalted creature in God's image would have had an organism, untrammelled by sin, equal to every emergency, so that from this world he could have peopled the entire material universe?

Now, if our author had consulted St. Paul, and had allowed him proper authority over his mind, he would

have saved himself a shameful position. For St. Paul declares, upon the authority of an inspired Apostle, Rom. 5 : 12 : "Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." Yet our author hesitates not to say, page 268 : "Sin, which entered the world 'by one man' is new, while death is ancient. The cause cannot be subsequent to the effect." It is evident that St. Paul or our author needs revising. The new version revises St. Paul, but makes no change here. "As through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin."

God said to Adam : "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."—Gen. 2 : 17. *Moth tamuth*, dying, thou shalt surely die ; *i. e.*, in the day of transgression thou shalt die morally, and dying morally, thou shalt die physically. Gen. 3 : 17 : "And unto Adam he said, Because thou has harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee saying thou shalt not eat of it," &c., "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground ; for out of it wast thou taken ; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

This is apparently the foundation of St. Paul's authority. The Apostle evidently means that by this transgression in the garden Adam committed the first sin, and that through this first sin the threat of God, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," was carried out, and death entered into the human race and Adam died, and in him, as the federal head, the race fell into sin and consequent death. Now, our

author, with Plagianism, says: "He most certainly included in his created constitution tendencies to death." "Death entered into the very essence of the economy." "Sin is new, death is ancient."

St. Paul says, I Cor. 15:21, 22: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Our author not only contradicts Paul; he also contradicts one even greater than Paul. The Master saith, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice," &c.—John 5:28, 29. Hence our author, joining with Pelagius, says man was born mortal; death was natural; the body is a clog, a burden; it must be left at the grave; it will never rise again; sin had nothing to do with its death; the resurrection is not the living again of the dead body, but the living on of the spirit, which is provided a new body when the old one perishes. Bodies are only cells in which to nourish spirits. God's plan is to raise spirits. Our author employs ten of his last pages to prove that death is natural, and hence not penal. Death was born in the beginning of creation. "Thus the fashion, habits and necessities of the structures built by life proclaim death to be normal and primitive. It is born of creation, not of retribution. It is God's offspring direct, not a penal device. It exists in the bosom of sinless, not sinning nature." Page 262. He succeeds at least in one thing, viz: In proving that he holds with Pelagianism, "That

Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he sinned or not." In these ten pages our author submits three arguments to prove this proposition:

1st. "One class of life is dependent for its subsistence on the destruction of another class."—Page 260.

2d. "My third proof is derived from the law of fecundation or propagation obtaining among living things."—Page 262.

3d. "My fourth argument is that death existed before sin, and could not be penal."—Page 267.

Now we desire to notice,

1st. Our author fails to separate two very different things, viz: The origin of death to man—mankind—and the origin of death to other living things in the lower kingdoms of life. This is fatal to his arguments. It comes from his failure to see that man is not an animal. "God created *man* from the dust," not an animal. St. Paul is arguing for the origin of death to man. He says particularly, "death passed upon all *men*, for all have sinned." "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." How foolish to suppose he is talking of the death and resurrection of animals, or insects, or sparrows, or plants. Hence our author begs the whole question. As to the question of the origin of death in the lower orders of creation, we neither accept nor reject our author's teaching; it may or it may not be true; we don't know; as it is not revealed, and as we were not at creation's dawn, we cannot be positive; but that

man was not created an animal, and that he was not created mortal, we do know upon the highest authority possible to have.

2d. Our author fails to show in his second argument any animal that is dependent upon man's life for existence. In order for this argument to have force he should show that there is a class of beings whose only food is man, and that on man alone they can exist, which is contrary to all facts. He should further show that this class of animals were created at the same time and place man was; and further, that they inhabit the earth still. We see the force of his argument for the lower orders as they are; but God gave man control of the lower orders, and all things were apparently made for man's use; but not one was made to exist upon human flesh. Hence, again, his argument does not apply to man.

3d. Our author's proof from the law of propagation fails to be applicable to man. He says, page 262: "My third proof is derived from the law of fecundation or propagation obtaining among living things." Then follows the most remarkable article I remember to have read. Hence it is very properly prefaced by our author thus: "Prepare to be surprised at what follows. I am sure the event will astonish you more than you can imagine."

Then follow some tables which show the remarkable fecundity of the English sparrow. Then he adds with the innocence of a child (page 265): "Let us substitute men for sparrows." But, we ask, what has man in common with a bird? Why substitute man

utes to traverse the length of this column of human flesh; and as there are but 525,600 minutes in a year, it would require fifty octillions of years for the ray to make the transit, a measure of which there are no parallels known, even in the sidereal spaces—quintillions of times greater than the distance between us and the most remote nebula.”

Now notice his conclusion, page 267, “We have introduced but three varieties of life of the millions of millions of species that the great God made to dwell on the face of the earth, and we have discovered (wonderful discovery) that these three would, in the space of a few years, not merely crowd the entire surface of the earth, but would pile it higher than the utmost known heavens, if death did not cut short their existence. What would it be if all the species were deathless?” “Nothing is more certain or obvious than that he who originated the realm of life, and appointed its fecundity, appointed death as its necessary concomitant. The one order includes the other; birth carried death not less certainly and necessarily than life in its embrace.” We must be excused if we fail to see but one argument in all this, viz: Our author holds to the teaching of Pelagianism: “Man was born mortal and would have died whether he sinned or not.”

We will suggest a few questions: (1.) If Adam had not sinned what would have become of this incomparable number of human beings? If we allow our author’s effort at evasion by reverting to the tree of life, page 244, what would have become of the un-

dying race? (2.) Where does our author get the authority for supposing the unsinning and undying race would live here on earth and propagate forever? Is not the teaching of Scripture clear that this earth is not our home? Was not the translation of Enoch and Elijah a direct object lesson, that man was destined to other climes? Are not the resurrection and ascension of Christ evidence that this earth is not man's eternal home? (3.) How does our author know unsinning man would have propagated so rapidly? (4.) If it was necessary to have death to keep man from filling the universe, even the sidereal heavens, and thus blocking the whole system with human flesh, what becomes of God's plan? We confess our inability to comprehend this wonderful table. I cannot comprehend the danger the table intimates. God's material universe in its vastness is beyond comprehension, as well as this table; and if this table is immense, God's universe is immensity itself. We think God could have in some way provided room for all the undying race that Adam would have propagated.

We will now find a new use for our "Recreations in Astronomy." Let us try to find a table large enough to spread our author's remarkable one upon.

How many can find room and support on earth even as it is now, cursed by sin, no one knows. How many would it have supported had man not sinned? How much room could God have provided in the Solar system, of which the earth is but as a small point (a pea to a barrel)? What of the room in

God's material universe called the Sidereal Heavens? What of the Circumpolar Constellation? What of the Equatorial Constellations? What of the Southern Circumpolar Constellations? H. W. Warren says, page 72, "If our earth were suddenly to dissolve its allegiance to the king of day, and attempt a flight to the North Star (the centre of the Circumpolar Constellation), and should maintain its flight of one thousand miles a minute, it would fly away toward Polaris for thousands of thousands of years, till a million years had passed away before it reached that northern dome of the distant sky and gave its new allegiance to another sun. The sun it had left behind it would gradually diminish till it was small as Arcturus, thus small as could be discerned by the naked eye, until at last it would finally fade out in utter darkness long before the new sun was reached." Light, which comes from the sun in eight minutes, takes forty-five years to come from Polaris, so that the light I look upon in his brilliant face started before I was born. O, what illimitable space! What illimitable greatness of room in the millions of millions of worlds, suns and systems. O, who would limit man to one by four feet when he is God's own child, and whom He so loved as to give His only begotten Son to take upon Him man's nature and to elevate Him as our brother to the sovereignty of the universe. Angels and archangels, principalities and powers of things in heaven and things in earth to bow before Him.

What though our author invents a wonderful table; is it impracticable for God to create worlds fast enough

to supply room for an unfallen, and hence an undying race? Let us direct his attention to the Milky Way, where 18,000,000 suns with their systems blaze and burn. And if our author still fears God's infinity should fail to take care of man's wonderful fecundity, let us call to our aid the Nebulæ System, from which, certainly, infinite possibilities may be seen from which an Almighty God might contrive to keep pace with man's fecundity.

“Can man conceive beyond what God can do?
 Nothing but quite impossible is hard.
 He summons into being with like ease,
 A whole creation, and a single grain.
 Speaks he the word! A thousand worlds are born!
 A thousand worlds? There's space for millions more;
 And in what space can His great fiat fail?
 Condemn me not, cold critic! but indulge
 The warm imagination; why condemn?”

Or with Isaiah let us ask: “Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers. That stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent *to dwell in.*” Isa. 4: 21, 22.

We do not claim to be good at figures, and must be excused if we fail to see with our author (page 267): “In the space of a few years not merely crowd the entire surface of the earth, but would pile it higher than the utmost known heavens if death did not cut short their existence,” and hence, “Nothing is more certain or obvious than that He who originated the

realm of life, and appointed its fecundity, appointed death as its necessary concomitant."

The New York "Christian Advocate" of November 8th, 1888, says :

"A minister of Baltimore computes on the basis given in the Apocalypse that heaven contains 5,759,750,000,000 rooms, each one being nineteen by sixteen feet in dimension. One of our early Methodist ministers preached a sermon on the subject in which he stated that every saint would have better accommodations than are given in the best rooms of a first-class hotel. Orson Pratt, the great Mormon, computed the room in acres; told the people of Salt Lake City to be faithful in agriculture, for they would get the benefit of it in the New Jerusalem. Such misuses of figures of speech were common in olden times, but to find any person at present using them otherwise than to obtain from them the fundamental ideas of grandeur, glory and reward, is surprising."

OUR AUTHOR'S FOURTH ARGUMENT.

"For man's natural mortality (page 267) my fourth argument is that death existed before sin and could not, therefore, be penal." "The historical argument, like the two preceding, is independent and in itself conclusive."

Our author here produces arguments to show that death ravaged the whole earth before man came upon it and, therefore, it could not come as a consequent of

sin, and he boastfully concludes, "Thus sin, which entered the world by one man, is new, while death is ancient. The cause cannot be subsequent to the effect."

St. Paul says, Romans, 5:12: "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Verse 17, "By one man's offence death reigned by one." Rev. Dr. Adam Clark says on this: "Death is here personified, and is represented as reigning over the human race, and death, of course, reigns unto death; he is known as reigning by the destruction of his subjects."

St. Paul, I Cor. 15:21: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die," &c. Dr. Clark says upon this: "*Mortality* came by *Adam*, *immortality* by *Christ*. So sure as all have been subjected to *natural death* by *Adam*, so sure shall all be *raised again* by *Christ Jesus*. *Mortality* and *immortality*, on a general ground, are the subject of the Apostle's reasoning here." The reader may choose between these authorities. St. Paul evidently is speaking of the origin of death to the human race; he says: "death passed upon all men;" he does not say "sparrows," or "cod-fish." Our author, or St. Paul, including Dr. Adam Clark, must be wrong; and we have no hesitancy in saying that our author, and not St. Paul, is wrong, and his error comes from the fundamental mistake of his system: "Man is a spirit; the body is as much an

animal as was ever born in the woods;" hence he is a heretic, and teaches that ancient heresy, "Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he sinned or not."

And this fundamental error leads inevitably to the fourth charge against Pelagianism.

The fourth charge against Pelagianism was, "That since neither by the death nor transgression of Adam the whole race dies, so neither will the whole human race rise again from the dead on account of Christ's resurrection." "Death entered into the very essence of the economy."—Page 251. "Death is born of creation, not of retribution. It existed in the bosom of sinless, not sinning nature."—Page 262. "Thus sin, which entered the world 'by one man,' is new, while death is ancient."—Page 268.

Hence the race does not die because Adam sinned, nor because he died, but by nature; therefore it is improper to say, "By man came death;" "In Adam all die," and likewise it is improper to say, "By man came also the resurrection of the dead;" "Even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Hence our author very consistently says, page 256: "The animal which served it well can serve it no longer; will have led the immortal to the door of his heaven, into which it cannot go, and, being no longer useful, but a clog and a shackle, will be left at the gate." "There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed."—Page 32. We need not quote further, and will rest.

SECOND, HIS SWEDENBORGIANISM.

Emanuel Swedenborg was a good man, a philosopher, a theologian, and a man of science. At the age of 57, A. D. 1745, he suddenly became a "seer," and spent the rest of his days as an interpreter of the mysteries of God, angels, the soul, and especially revelation, with heaven and hell. Wherein he followed the word of God he is all right. He may be right in many of his speculations. But that he is wrong, and even ludicrous, in many more, is certainly conceded. Now, in comparing our author with Swedenborgianism, we do not claim by any means that he has been led into all of his vagaries, but we are sure that he has drank either from the same stream with Swedenborg, or drank from him, for he is so near alike upon the subject-matter found in "Beyond the Grave," that they show the same parentage. We shall quote from the two authors fairly but briefly, and let our readers draw their own inference. We can only judge the tree by the fruit it bears. There is one very marked difference between our author and Mr. Swedenborg, viz: Their source of knowledge. Our author says: "We do not know that death does not end all," page 17; and page 18: "We may have exact truth, some truth, or no truth at all."

While Mr. Swedenborg says he has experimental knowledge, page 294: "But to converse with spirits, and to be with them as one of their number, has been granted me even in full wakefulness of the

body, and this now for many years." Page 292: "That man is a spirit has been taught me by much experience. . . . That I might be confirmed in this, I have been permitted to converse with almost all whom I ever knew when they lived in the body. . . . That I might be sure of it and bear testimony to its truth."

Since our author rejects the evidence of the forty days of Christ's testimony that he was in the resurrection state, we can see how he consequently must admit that he does not know that death does not end all; and that "we may have exact truth, some truth, or no truth at all." Hence I am at a loss to see how he knows anything at all. He says, like Swedenborg, that man is a spirit, but since he does not tell us how he knows, we must take it for granted that he has been with Swedenborg and learned of him. A few quotations will demonstrate at least a possible source of our author's information.

Our author says "man is a spirit." And page 78, "Beyond the Grave," "You see that I am making everything of the fact that I am not my body. That is everything to me." This, as I have shown in Chapters I and II, is the whole drift of the volume. Mr. Swedenborg ("Heaven and Hell," page 289) says: "Whoever duly considers the subject, may know that the body does not think, because it is material; but that the soul does think, because it is spiritual. The soul of man, about the immortality of which so many have written, is his spirit; for this is immortal as to all that pertains to it. It is this also which thinks in

the body, for it is spiritual; and what is spiritual receives what is spiritual, and lives spiritually, which is to think and to will. All the rational life, therefore, which appears in the body, belongs to the spirit, and nothing of it to the body; for the body, as was said above, is material; and materiality, which is proper to the body, is added, and almost as it were adjoined, to the spirit in order that the spirit of man may live, and perform uses in the natural world, whereof all things are material and in themselves void of life. And since what is material does not live, but only what is spiritual, it may be evident that whatever lives in man is his spirit, and that the body only serves it, as an instrument is subservient to a living, moving force. It is said, indeed, of an instrument, that it acts, moves, or strikes; but to believe that these acts are those of the instrument, and not of him who acts, moves or strikes by means of it, is a fallacy. Since everything that lives in the body, and from life acts and feels, belongs exclusively to the spirit, and nothing of it to the body, it follows that the spirit is the real man; or, what is similar, that man considered in himself is a spirit." Again, page 295: "Man is not man by virtue of the body, but by virtue of the spirit." Also, page 299: "Man is man by virtue of his spirit, and not by virtue of his body."

Now, who can fail to see our author's exact similitude? Read "Beyond the Grave," page 26, and on: "The proposition asserts, not simply that there are these two parts to man—an organism of earth and an indwelling spirit—but that the deepest truth, the

very essence of his manhood is, that he is a spirit." "The form is wholly destitute of power of any kind. . . . It is idiotic and beastly; it neither sees, nor hears, nor tastes; it is purely an instrument and servant. The spirit, on the other hand, is a proprietor and master." "The material being is simply an instrumental arrangement, or organism, for the use of the deeper man, which is a spiritual being, and is separate and distinct from the material organization; as separate and distinct as from any tools which he uses and employs." "He is as really distinct from the hand as he is from the saw or hammer, or brush or pen." Given this similarity of teaching on the fundamental question, "man is a spirit," it is but natural that the final outcome shall be very much alike.

Mr. Swedenborg says (page 307, "Heaven and Hell"): "When a man passes from the natural into the spiritual world, he takes with him all things belonging to him as a man, except his terrestrial body. . . . In a word, when man passes from one life into the other, or from one world into the other, it is just as if he passed from one place to another; and he carries with him all things which he possessed in himself as a man; so that it cannot be said that man after death—which is only the death of the terrestrial body—has lost anything that belonged to himself." Our author says (page 248, "Beyond the Grave"): "There is nothing that pertains to a body, either its necessities or pleasures, that would be agreeable to carry up

through eternity." "The soul or self must in some way attain deliverance from physical thralldom."

Again ("Beyond the Grave," page 243): "Analogy, therefore, leads us to conclude that when the human body is dissolved, the immaterial principle by which it was animated continues to think and act, either in a state of separation from all body, or in some material vehicle to which it is ultimately united, and which goes off with it at death."

Again (page 158), our author says: "The resurrection, therefore, is deliverance from the gross, material body, and resumption without it in the spiritual world."

Let us now give close attention to the similarity of Mr. Swedenborg and our author, especially on the resurrection. Mr. Swedenborg (page 295, "Heaven and Hell") says: "When the body is no longer capable of performing its functions in the natural world, corresponding to the thoughts and affections of its spirit, which are from the spiritual world, then a man is said to die. But still the man does not die, but is only separated from the corporeal part; for the man himself lives. It is said the man himself lives, because man is not man by virtue of the body," &c. "Hence it is evident that when man dies, he only passes from one world into another; hence it is that death signifies resurrection and continuance of life." "By resuscitation is meant the drawing forth of the spirit from the body, and its introduction into the spiritual world, which is commonly called resurrec-

tion." Our author describes the resurrection in similar language ("Beyond the Grave," page 182): "The resurrection is the standing again after death; the body of the resurrection is the body with which the spirit is clothed for its celestial life. [Listen.] The organizing life principle is uninterrupted and identical. It begins in the natural and weaves its curious integuments of dust for earthly use; it weaves the new robes for the departing soul; it fashions the celestial organism." Again ("Beyond the Grave," page 224): "The soul wakes up in the future world, or passes into it, as it passes from one city to another, with as little interruption of its faculties. In its transfer, however, it loses the services of the physical senses. They have finished their functions and disappear. How this affects its relations to material affairs, we do not know; possibly it interrupts commerce with this life entirely; and on many accounts it may be desirable that it should; but if there is the loss of the gross, physical sense, we may infer there is the acquisition of a higher order of sensorium, by which it becomes related to the spiritual realm." Now, if our author could add the personal experience of Mr. Swedenborg, on page 200, we might be led to accept his authority: "I have also conversed with some two days after their decease, and have told them that preparations were now being made for their interment. They replied that their friends did well to reject that which had served them so well for a body and its uses in the world; and they wished me to say that they were not dead, but alive, being men now, just the same as be-

fore, and that they had only migrated from one world to another, and that they were not conscious of having lost anything, since they were in a body, and in possession of bodily senses as before."

Foster—"The animal, being no further useful, but a clog, will be left at the gate."

Swedenborg—"When man dies, he only passes from one world into another; or passes from one place to another."

Foster—"The soul wakes up in the future world, or passes into it, as it passes from one city to another."

S.—"But the man does not die; but is only separated from the corporeal part; for the man himself lives."

F.—"The organizing life principle is uninterrupted and identical."

S.—"When they are dead they appear to themselves to be in a body."

F.—"It will be clothed upon with a new form when the old one perishes."

S.—"The departed said that their friends did well to reject that which had served them well for a body."

F.—"I wish to put on record here that, for myself, there is nothing that ever belonged to my body that creates in me the least desire to ever see it again."

S.—Page 352: "That the spirit of man, after its separation from the body, is itself a man." "Man was created to become an angel."—Page 203.

F.—Page 185: "It is revealed that they are spirits, freed from physical drudgery."

"It is that of a soul forever growing." "A vast

community of spirits." "Ages fly away." "Æons and cycles." "I am one of that immortal host." "Thou, Gabriel, I shall stand where thou standest."

"These are some of the passages taken alternately from our author and Mr. Swedenborg. We are satisfied that they show conclusively that the authors are, in the main, in entire harmony on the nature of man and of his resurrection, which our author is candid enough to admit. On page 158, after quoting the doctrine held by the "New Church Faith," he says: "This view, we do not doubt, is, in the main, in the direction of truth." We are sure there can be no doubt but our author is, in the main, Swedenborgian as to his spirit-man and his spirit-resurrection.

But the great, solemn question remains unanswered. How can a Methodist Bishop be in such hearty accord with Mr. Swedenborg, and so directly opposite to Mr. Wesley, and yet retain his episcopal office in the Methodist Church? Why not join the "New Jerusalem Church?" Why employ his high and holy office to spread heresy, instead of driving it away, both publicly and privately, as he solemnly promised in his ordination vows? What does the church mean by sitting supinely by and allowing any man, much less a Bishop, to sow broadcast such rank heresy through the length and breadth of our church? O, God, how can it be that it has come to this? Can it be possible that it has come to this, that our church is about to leave the well of living water for cisterns that can hold no water? Is Thy word so deficient that we need a philosophical dreamer to rise, and with

spirit gibberings, to teach us how the dead arise? O, God, shall we be turned aside from the "life, the truth, the way," for the muttering and stuttering of a cracked-brain philosopher? Great God, forbid.

Need I pause to show that Pelagianism and Swedenborgianism are untrue? Has it come to this, that these teachings must be met in the very heart of the Methodist Church; and that one without position, or name, or money, or patronage must meet, single-handed, unpanoplied, a great giant, clothed in all the authority of a Bishop of the greatest church on earth, clothed from head to foot in an armor more impregnable than the Goliath David met? No; we will not stop here to show that these doctrines are untrue, and contrary to the teaching of the best philosophy and the united voice of the universal church, as well as diametrically contrary to the teaching of God's immutable word. But we will go out, like David of old, with our simple sling and smooth stones in the name of our God, and slay this great giant, who for ten years has gone out and defied the host of our God.

CHAPTER VI.

SOME OF OUR AUTHOR'S INCONSISTENCIES.

FIRST INCONSISTENCY.

The first inconsistency of our author is in the plan and scope of his book. If he had simply given us a philosophical treatise on man as a spiritual being, we would have let it pass, for only philosophers would have read it, and it would have done but little harm. But, like many authors, he only gives a little philosophy, and then draws conclusions, which a true philosophy will not admit, and in these conclusions he strikes a practical blow at the resurrection of our bodies, which the most illiterate may read to their damage. If he had given us a treatise upon the resurrection, pure and simple (*i. e.*, if he had put his teaching in undisguised simplicity on the resurrection), the church would have risen in arms long ago; and only because of this inconsistent mixing and covering has the heresy been taken, covered by a sweet sentimentalism, a beautiful rhetoric, and the logic of a sophist; *e. g.*, "Nothing is more certain than that Jesus taught as one of his cardinal truths the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. Disbelief of that truth is as in-

disputable heresy as disbelief in the divine mission of Jesus."—Page 151. "When finally it, *the body*, sickens and dies, and becomes unresponsive to our cries of affection, we say our friend is dead." . . . "We consign the quickly decaying form to the grave. We know that it soon moulders to dust. There is not a single sign that it will ever germinate, or return to life. There is every indication that it never will."—Page 23.

The two pages are eternally inconsistent. No sophistry can make his transmigration of the soul out of the old body into a new one, when the old one perishes, a resurrection of the dead.

SECOND INCONSISTENCY.

The second inconsistency consists in darkening counsel on the subject of our knowledge. Pages 16 and 17, he says: "However it may awaken surprise, truth demands that we should make the confession that we do not know that death does not end all," &c. Page 12: "No greater proof can exist than a 'thus saith the Lord'—not even our direct cognition; but we must *know* that it is a 'thus saith the Lord;' and we intuitively know that between a 'thus saith the Lord' and our immediate cognitions, there never will or can be contradiction."

How can these two assertions be consistent? "We do not know that death does not end all." "No greater proof can exist than a 'thus saith the Lord;'" not even our direct cognition. The Lord said (John

5:28): "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth." Now, does our author teach that we do not know that death does not end all? or do we not know that this quotation is a "thus saith the Lord?" This kind of inconsistency should not be in a book that treats upon so grave a subject, and his warning from the religious and secular press, as well as from ministers and laymen, should have opened his eyes to see the inconsistency. And yet, in the face of this warning, and of his own statement (page 12), he goes on to say (page 17): "Where he is, or that he is at all, is absolutely unknown to us. Our consciousness is silent on the subject," &c. This not only makes him inconsistent with himself, but also with truth. Our consciousness is not silent on the subject; "We know that if our earthly house were dissolved we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."—St. Paul, II Cor. 5:1. "Knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus." Again, "I know whom I have believed." If our author had said that by our direct cognition, or by our five senses, we have no positive knowledge that death does not end all, we would acquiesce; but when he, in the face of his assertion on page 12, goes on to say: "Our consciousness is silent on the subject," and relegates all our knowledge outside of sense perceptions to the ghostland of mere guess work, as on page 18: "In mere opinions or beliefs there may be exact truth,

some truth, or no truth at all; or possibly there may be some truth and some error in each case."

Because we have never touched, tasted, smelt, seen, or heard the life beyond the grave, is that an argument that our consciousness must be silent on the subject? Is there no road by which our consciousness may know truth but by the five senses? If this is so we may well admit that "we do not know that death does not end all;" for we never knew that anyone, except some crazy Swedenborg, claimed to know by sense perception that death did not end all. Then why should our author make the marvelous statement that we don't know simply because the sense perception fails to reach out across the river of death, and fails to touch with her tentacles the trees of life on the other shore?

Why should he jump to the conclusion that there is no knowledge of God because we cannot see, or hear, or by the five senses commune with Him? O, eternal shades, can it be? We say it is inconsistent for our author to say that our consciousness is silent; and that if death does not end all we don't know it, and that our belief of it is only a guess so, a maybe so, with some truth, or no truth at all, and that our religion only furnishes a clue by which we hold on with "misgivings, doubts and fears." We say it is inconsistent with truth, and the known consciousness, or conscious knowledge of the ages. We admit that conscious knowledge is the only real knowledge that we have. The five senses

are but five avenues by which we know the outer world.

When my fingers touch a solid substance, and the nerves have reported to the inner conscious ego, then I know the substance is hard; but are these five avenues the only ones that bring knowledge to this knower? Then what has man but an inheritance common with the animal world?

If this is true, then we are shut up to "misgivings, doubts and fears" with a vengeance, and his following pages are all mere speculations.

But it is false. There are other avenues beside these five, and our consciousness is not silent on this grave subject.

John Jones is an orphan. He was born on a summer evening and found on a gentleman's front steps. He is now twenty-one years of age. Ask him: "Who was your father and who was your mother?" "I don't know." "Well, John, did you have any father and mother?" Can there be anything but an affirmative answer? John knows he had a mother and father, but how does he know? He never saw, heard, or by any of the five senses learned it. No one need ever tell him, and yet he knows that he had parents. John may know a great many things, but he will never know anything more thoroughly and satisfactorily than this. Nothing that will have less "misgivings, doubts and fears," though he may be a very learned man. Is his consciousness silent upon this subject?

This is knowledge that is perfectly satisfactory to me. Now, our author says (page 17): "John, you may

imagine that you know that you had parents when you were a little fellow, and we are not anxious to dispossess you of the pleasing delusion; it cannot harm you."

John Jones' knowledge, that he had parents, is not intuitive, but *inferential*. His universal experience from his senses have informed him that it is so in the case of all other men and women; and that, therefore, there is an overwhelming probability and assurance that it must be so with him. This is an induction, not an immediate, but a mediate, knowledge; but it is just as good and as effective as any direct experience; and both in popular language and in science this form of assurance, when very strong, and when not a tithe as strong as this, is called knowledge. So from Scripture and the testimony of dying saints to whom the heavens have been opened, we have such irresistible proof of immortal life beyond this that the assurance of it is as strong as any knowledge the senses can give; and far better supported rationally than anything affirmed, or seemingly affirmed, by the senses of any one individual. The individual may be mistaken. He may be under some hallucination. He may easily misinterpret his senses. But when he listens to an unbroken series of testimonies from all ages, including those of the inspired Word, there is no reasonable ground for doubt or question. It is irrational and perverse to doubt; and to the spiritual and devout mind, doubt is impossible. This is so strong that he calls it in accordance with the common, as well as scientific use of language, knowledge. It

is a true, rational knowledge. Hence, St. Paul says : " For we *know* that if this earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." For a Methodist Bishop to contradict this, and say we do *not* know, is a singular and extraordinary course, to say the least ; and for anyone to say it, is either to express an unspiritual skepticism, or to use words in a peculiar and unadvisable way.

Then there is such a thing as intuitive knowledge, sometimes called innate ; and I contend that we have a spiritual faculty of intuition, most largely developed in the most spiritual minds, by which we immediately discern the truth of the great principle of the immortality of moral issues, and that the Bible must be true in affirming this, and the consequent immortality of the righteous and the wicked.

Innate—1. Inborn ; native ; natural. 2. Originating in, or derived from, the constitution of the intellect, as opposed to being acquired from experience.—*Noah Webster*.

Has our author ever heard of innate knowledge ? Who will tell how much of human knowledge is innate ? Who will tell which is the most reliable knowledge, innate or acquired ? Is it a pleasing delusion ?

Is our author mistaken when he says (page 12) : " No greater proof can exist than a ' thus saith the Lord,' not even our direct cognition ? " Or is he mistaken and inconsistent when he says (page 17) : " We do not know but death ends all ; our consciousness is

silent on the subject?" Is he correct when he says (page 131): "That God is, *I know*; my intuitions and consciousness touch Him?" Why and how should he have a consciousness and know God, and yet not know that death does not end all? Why rest on God but be full of doubts, misgivings and fears on the other? O, palpable inconsistency!

On the lower peninsula of New Jersey there is a famous watering place, called Cape May City. We were brought up within thirty miles of it; we have spent all our life within New Jersey; we have often been within twenty miles of it, and often been on the West Jersey Railroad and heard the cry, This car goes to Cape May City; in fact, we have some relations who live there, and we have been privileged to meet them frequently, but still we have never been there; we have never seen, heard, touched, tasted or smelt Cape May City; therefore, according to our author, we do not know that there is such a city. "However it may awaken surprise," we must make the confession that we do not know that there is such a city as Cape May. This is materialism with a vengeance. Now, we do not claim to know that there is such a city by our own sense perceptions, but we will not admit that, therefore, we do not know positively that there is such a city. We do know that there is a Cape May City in New Jersey. We have never been in London, or Rome, or Jerusalem; therefore, according to our author, we do not know that there are such cities. We have never seen George Washington, Napoleon, King Herod or Jesus Christ; there-

fore we do not know that they ever existed. For the inhabitants of Genoa and of Europe to doubt Christopher Columbus when he said there was an undiscovered continent across the western sea, was very sensible ; but for us who have never been in Europe, to doubt the existence of Europe, is simply impossible. So, for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, yea, or the disciples themselves, to doubt the fact of the dead Jesus coming back to life, was reasonable, after they had seen him hanging dead, and afterward prepared him for burial. We don't wonder even at Thomas saying, "Unless I shall put my finger in the prints of the nail, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe;" but after that was done, and after every possibility of deception was swept away, it was impossible that they should not know; and for our author to say: "There is not a single fact within our reach that furnishes us absolute knowledge, and that we do not know, therefore we are liable to have misgivings, doubts and fears," is as foolish as for the Genoese to say now we do not know that there is a continent beyond the rolling sea, or for us to say we do not know there is a city in New Jersey called Cape May. This inductive knowledge is the great element and result of science, and the inspiration and guide of practical life.

Man not only has a material nature by which he becomes acquainted with the outer world, but he has a rational nature by which he reasons, forms judgments and conclusions; not only so, but he has a spiritual nature by which he comes in possession of

knowledge of the spiritual world. I know that grass is green because I have seen it. The perfection of that knowledge will depend upon the perfection of my optic nerves. I know there is a city called Cape May because I have the power of forming proper conclusions without a personal physical knowledge of the city, and that knowledge will depend upon certain laws of evidence and certain powers of mind for the correctness of its knowledge. So in regard to the highest knowledge of the human understanding.

Every effect must have a proper cause. John Jones knows that he must have had parents. We know the first parents must have had an adequate and proper cause. That first cause must be God, from whom the child received his powers.—See St. Paul before the philosophers of Athens.

The spiritual nature of man has its knowledge. I know that I am. I know that I have a physical nature. I know that I have a rational mind. I know that I have a spiritual nature. I commune with God. God touches my inner consciousness. We are free to admit that all human knowledge is very imperfect as to detail and in non-essential particulars. From the least to the greatest; from the molecule to the mountain, from insect to man, from man to archangel, all knowledge is finite; for the infinite one has taught us that as the heavens are above the earth, so his ways are above ours. All our knowledge is human except the thus saith the Lord, and even that is handed to us in human vessels; but it is the best we have, and we know it is a sufficient light to guide us in all

essential particulars safely. But we claim this is as much so of the evidence of the five senses as it is of the other avenues to our consciousness. Who doesn't know that for ages to our race the sun circled around this small globe? Who doesn't know to how large an extent the railroad men are color-blind? Who will tell us how color-blind those are who set up the standard by which others are tried? So we might go through all lines of human knowledge and point out mistakes. But shall we say because human knowledge is imperfect, and in non-essentials liable to error, therefore we will not follow the best light we have? Shall we join the idealist and say, because we cannot perfectly understand the material world, therefore, there is no material world? With Bishop Berkley shall we say: "There are no trees, or rocks, or stars," because we cannot know all there is in the material world? Or shall we say: "All, therefore, which really exists is spirit, or 'the thinking principle' —ourselves, our fellowmen, and God." O, how foolish. What an idle dreamer. I don't wonder that his hypochondriacal tendency at length fully showed itself. But if idealism, which can boast the greatest names, is unreasonable, what shall we say of our author's teaching? If Bishop Berkley can sweep away our material universe, and if our author can sweep away all knowledge except that which comes through the five senses, and leave all other knowledge only full of doubts, fears and misgivings, then is not Hume about right in denying the reliableness of all human knowledge? If only the sense-knowledge is reliable,

what need we care about it? If, with one sweep, our author is to cast discredit upon all our innate, God-given knowledge; if the knowledge of God, of Christ, and salvation, yea, of the future life, is but a myth, then I don't care whether Hume, Bishop Berkley, or Bishop Foster is right. What do I care about my finger-tips, or the size of my eye-ball, if my soul-knowledge is only full of "misgivings, doubts and fears?" I say, avaunt, thou worse than a midnight ghoul! Rob the grave of the dead if you will, but, oh, rob not the soul of its divine knowledge.

If our author has no knowledge outside his finger tips, let him enjoy it if he will; but he should not be allowed to sit in his high office and rob others of it.

The Master said: "It is given unto you to *know* the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given."—Matt. 13: 11. "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not *revealed* it unto thee, but *my Father* which is in heaven."—Matt. 16: 17. Jesus said: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast *revealed* them unto babes." . . . "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither *knoweth* any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will *reveal Him*."—Matt. 11: 25, 27. "If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine."—John 7: 17. St Paul says: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath *revealed them unto us by*

His spirit; for the spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man *knoweth* the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God *knoweth* no man, but the spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might *know* the things that are freely given us of God," &c.—I Cor 2:9-11. St. Paul never saw Jesus in the flesh; never touched his pierced hands or rifted side, but still he said: "I *know* whom I have believed."—II Tim. 1:12. Saul was on his way to Damascus; "And suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven," &c.—Acts 9:3. Now, I ask, where has our author been that he should not have these things *revealed unto him*? Is he one of the wise ones? Is it possible that he can be one of those spoken of in I Cor. 2:14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he *know* them because they are *spiritually discerned*." Also: "For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written: He taketh the wise in their own craftiness."—I Cor. 3:19. Let Rabbi Krauskopf teach "that it is of this present existence only that we have any positive knowledge, hence our sacred duty belongs to this life," but I say it is inconsistent for a Christian Bishop or a Methodist to teach what our author does in regard to our knowledge of the super-sensible. It matters not to us whether knowledge comes to us "through the innate inspirations" with Plato which the Creator put there before birth, or like

Locke deny the reality of innate ideas altogether, and teach that a part of our knowledge is received from the cognition of the outer world, and the other part by the perception of the operations of our own minds. We claim that we do know that death does not end all with as correct a knowledge as that by which we know anything outside of our own conscious existence. I am; I exist; I think; and from this fundamental basis we arrive at all knowledge; and of all the knowledge that comes to us none is so true, none so valuable as the knowledge of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is verified, not only in the Bible, but in our own most secret self, our own conscious nature. "Man believeth with the heart (inner consciousness) unto righteousness." I know there is a God, and that I have a soul which has met with God. They have met in the dark, it is true, but I have felt him. I know him, and with Charles Wesley we sing:

" We *know*, by faith we *know*
If this vile house of clay,
This tabernacle sink below,
In ruinous decay,
We have a house above,
Not made with mortal hands,
And firm as our Redeemer's love
That heavenly fabric stands."

" We by his spirit *prove*,
And *know* the things of God."

" The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits,
that we are the children of God. And if children,

then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, that we may be also glorified together."—Romans 8:16, 17.

If, as Descartes says, as is represented by Huxley's Lay Sermons (page 324): "As the record of his progress tells us, he was obliged to confess that life is full of delusions; that authority may err; that testimony may be false or mistaken; that reason lands us in endless fallacies; that memory is often as little trustworthy as hope; that the evidence of the very senses may be misunderstood; that dreams are real as long as they last, and what we call reality may be a long and restless dream. . . . What, then, is certain? Our thoughts. 'I think, therefore, I am.'" And Mr. Huxley, on page 328, would reduce this certainty to just one-third, *i. e.*, he would cancel the I, the therefore, and leave "think," as the only knowledge. Now if "think" is the only really known knowledge, why should our author, a Christian philosopher, sweep away from our authorities, and single out our best and richest knowledge, and by one stroke blot them out forever, while holding to the lower and least valuable, and the least provable knowledges with a deathless grasp? Why cry out against the voice of the book, the church, the inner consciousness of the ages and say, "Truth demands that we should make the confession that we do not know that death does not end all?"—Page 16. Why don't he say that truth demands that we admit that we don't know anything? Or, if the philosopher reduces our absolute knowledge to the bald "think," we may rest our religious

knowledge upon the experimental "know." If from this foundation stone of bare knowledge "think," the path may be traced out to all the lines of human intelligence, so the Christian can rest upon his experimental "know," and from it follow the path out to all the fullness of the divine life in Christ Jesus. The blind man said: "I was blind; now I see." So, also, we "know" that we have passed from death unto life. I was dead, but am alive. I am just as conscious that I "know," as I am that I "think," and from this blessed inner conscious knowledge I can trace out my way into the clearest light along the line of innate knowledge and proper testimony until I do know that death does not, yea, cannot, end all.

No, no. We do know with even more assurance than any other knowledge, that "if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son; much more, being reconciled we shall be saved by his life." "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto *eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. 5:10-21. "*Knowing* that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more," &c.; "likewise reckon ye also yourselves alive unto God," &c.—Rom. 6:9-11. Thank God, it is given unto us "to know the mysteries of the kingdom."

Are we wrong, then, in demanding that this shall not be incorporated in our body of divinity? Shall we mix such untempered clay in our foundation stones? We say, No; never. Imagine in the future a discussion on which may hang the welfare of many souls.

Rationalism having cursed the continent, already reaches across the sea for other conquests. Methodism must meet and conquer this foe to all righteousness. But in the midst of the discussion, the rationalistic foe, after adducing its subtle arguments with the skill of a St. Paul, appealing to their own poets, appeals to Methodist authorities, and says, Bishop Foster, one of your own Bishops and theologians, is frank enough to admit that "truth demands that we should make the confession that we do not know that death does not end all;" and now, with this great Bishop, "If there are any who imagine that they know, we are not anxious to dispossess them of the pleasing delusion—it cannot harm them." Are we willing that any such false teaching shall be thrust into our face? We answer, No, it must not be.

THIRD INCONSISTENCY.

NOTES.—Prof. Mitchell says: "Who shall reveal to us the true cosmography of the universe by which we are surrounded? It is the work of an Omnipotent Architect. Around us and above us rise sun and system, cluster and universe; and I doubt not that in every region of this vast empire of God, hymns of praise and anthems of glory are rising and reverberating from sun to sun, and from system to system, heard by Omnipotence alone across immensity and through eternity."

Dr. Dick: "It is now considered by astronomers as highly probable, if not certain, from late observation, from the nature of gravitation, and other circumstances, that all the systems of the universe revolve around one common centre; and that this centre may bear as great a proportion, in point

of magnitude, to the universal assemblage of systems, as the sun does to his surrounding planets. And since our sun is five hundred times larger than the earth and all other planets and their satellites taken together on the same scale, such a central body would be five hundred times larger than all the systems and worlds in the universe. If this is in reality the case, it may, with the most emphatic propriety, be termed *The Throne* of God. . . . Here the glorified body of the Redeemer may have taken its principal station as 'the head of all principalities and powers.'"—"Philosophy of a Future State," p. 224.

Our author's third inconsistency consists in degrading the body, or the material nature, of man.

The ancient philosophers who had not our Christian teaching, and believed the souls of men had a pre-existent origin and history, in which they fell and were cursed or punished by being placed in material bodies, to be delivered from which was their highest good, were consistent in looking upon their bodies and all material nature as low, evil and temporary. But I am at a loss to conceive how a Christian philosopher, with the New Testament teaching of the dignity and holiness of the body, and that forever glorified by the second person of the divine trinity taking upon Him its nature, living, suffering, dying, rising, ascending in and glorifying it at the right hand of God the Father, where he lives in his glorified body, to die no more. "I was dead, but behold I am alive." And not only so, but the third person of the blessed trinity also glorifies the human body by condescending to make it his abode.

"What, know ye not that your body is the temple

of the Holy Ghost.”—I Cor. 6:19. “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God. . If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.”—I Cor. 3:16, 17. “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again.” “I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.”—Rom. 12:1. “Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body; and God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power. Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, for ye are bought with a price. Therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God’s.” “I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved.” Thus the whole trend and spirit of the New Testament teaching are certainly very different from our author’s teaching. Let me quote: Page 29, “The form (*i. e.*, the body) is wholly destitute of power of any kind.” [Strange, but where does the spirit get his power from? Whence his proprietorship?] “It would not continue to exist if left to itself.” Sure? Who knows who is first in this man? “It must be fed, and clothed, and doctored.” Yes; but who doctors and feeds it? And why don’t the same one continue to feed and doctor it which opens the eyes first? “It is idiotic.” Alas, poor body! My horse and dog are very intelligent! This, to me, is a very serious charge. How about those memory plates that “were not material?” Why, if it is the body merely that is

idiotic, should any of us be idiots? Page 49: "It is my slave. It cannot think for itself, so I must keep watch for it, clothe, feed, coddle, &c. I command the machine." Page 63: "Some day I shall drop the machine and take wing." Page 161: "Fact and reason teach us that it (the body) is only a definite quantity of oxygen and other gases." Page 182: "I wish to put on record that there is nothing that ever belonged to my body that creates in me the least desire to ever see it again." Also, 256: "The animal . . . the clog, the shackle, will be left at the gate."

How differently St. Paul writes (Rom. 8:23): "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of our bodies." Of course the Apostle Paul knew that the body, in its present condition, was cursed by sin the same as the spirit, and needed sanctifying, but he waited and groaned for its redemption, not its casting aside; and well does he say that this weakness and corruptibleness came through sin; "For since by man came death," "Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." And the redemption was not from its material nature, but from its corruption and death. Hence he says: "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, we shall be changed;" *i. e.*, glorified, redeemed, and made like unto his glorious body. As the electric spark changes the black steel into a flaming sun, so the divine Christ shall change this human body into the glories of the resurrection, as Christ was transfigured, and his face

shone brighter than the sun, even transfiguring his clothing.

We claim that it is inconsistent for a follower of Christ to degrade the human body. Christ has exalted it. Christ brought it to life and ascended to the right hand of God with it, or else deceived the disciples. And the promise is that these (now) vile bodies shall be changed and made like his glorious body.

Shall we then ignore this, and instead of a resurrected, glorified human body, demand that we become spirits as God and angels?

We would not detract one iota from the possible glory of the spirit universe, but we do demur against insulting or degrading the material universe. We believe they each have their own individuality and their own glory. They are not one, but two. Our author, with the ancient philosophers, seems to look with disdain upon the material universe.

God created man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living being, thus uniting the spiritual and the material universes. Let us not, like the materialist, minify or ignore the spiritual universe; and on the other hand we should not swing to the other extreme and ignore or despise the material universe. It is not for us finite creatures to understand the infinite. It is inconsistent for the materialist to ignore the spiritual universe simply because it is supersensible, and in our present state of knowledge it lies above us, any more than the infinity of the material universe should be ignored. Who doesn't know that the more secret laws

of the material cosmos are as mysterious and supersensible as the laws of the spirit world? How little we know of the secret laws and their influences in material nature. Suppose we reduce all nature to matter, eliminate spirit, what have we gained; do we know any more about the cause of things? Are the paths into the secrets of our environments any more illuminated? Do the dark questions resolve themselves? What is space, where its beginning and ending? Whence cometh matter? Where are its foundations? What is life and whence its fountain? What is death and what its beyond? What is attraction and gravitation? "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion?" Has man learned the a b c of his material environment? Do not the depths of the sea and of the earth remain unexplored, while the very atmosphere remains un-navigated? What of other worlds? What of the secret springs of all power, life, and light? Shall science or human knowledge in its swaddling clothes dictate to us about a spiritual universe when it knows not the beginning of its own? How does the scientist know what lies beyond; and may not there be a door somewhere in the secrets of nature where light is born, and life opens its eyes, through which he may enter into the spirit universe? Somewhere where the spirit of God touches the secret springs of human consciousness, and man enters into the spiritual sunrise? Or would it be any more satisfactory to claim that all intelligence must be material, no matter how attenuated, spiritual or ethereal? If we say man is

only matter organized, developed from the lower forms, will it set bounds to developments in other undiscovered realms of the cosmos in the past *eons*?

If man is a developed monkey, and he is to go on forever developing, who knows when the morning stars sang their first song, and the first beings began their onward course? Is it not then the boast of the ignorant, short-sighted, yea, the blind, to say there is no God, or spirit, or angel? Most certainly. So, also, we gain nothing by running to the other extreme. Matter is of God. The material universe is great and grand.

When our author says (page 29): "The body is destitute of power, is idiotic, beastly, neither sees, nor hears, nor tastes." Would he teach that only spirit has power, life, mind? Only spirit sees, hears, and tastes? The grass, the trees, the bugs, the reptiles, the oyster, the jelly-fish, yea, all, save inorganic matter, must have a spirit as well as a material nature. And what better is this than materialism?

No. "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." There is a spiritual universe, and there is a material universe. Each separate and distinct. Each under and subject to its own laws.

God, the infinite author of all, is a spirit. In His wisdom He concluded to create man from the material universe and to breathe His own spiritual nature into this material creation and thus marry the two universes together as one unique being—*Homo*. And the whole Bible story, as well as our own experiences and observation, is to this effect. The incarnation,

the redemption, the death, resurrection, ascension and mediatorial reign of Jesus Christ are to this effect, and St. Paul most clearly and wonderfully sets forth this doctrine in I Cor. 15: "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming," &c. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." "But some man will say how are the dead raised up," &c. Can any unbiased man read this without seeing that St. Paul is writing about the glorious resurrection of the dead body, the material nature of man? He is not writing about the spirit that does not die, but returns to God; he is writing constantly about the body. Christ is risen from the dead. Joseph's new tomb is vacated. Death itself shall finally be destroyed. From verse 35 to 54 St. Paul gives one of the most beautiful and conclusive arguments ever penned that the dead shall live and that the body, the material nature, shall be changed, glorified, spiritualized.

The question put by the objector is: "With what body do they come?" There is no question about the spirit-nature of man, but it all relates to the re-living of the dead body. St. Paul had demonstrated that Christ had risen and that he was the first fruits, or pledge, of them that slept, and the unbelief that has always characterized the natural heart still cries, How

are the dead raised up and with what body do they come? and the argument that was inspired and satisfactory to the heathen world, and has conquered the unbelieving world, should be strong enough to convince our author. (Verses 36 and 37.)

St. Paul explains or illustrates the possibility of the dead body living; in fact, except it die it cannot be quickened. (Verses 37 and 38.) He shows that it is not raised without death and destruction, as one might go and dig up a planted grain; but that from this corruptible grain rises another according to the nature of the seed planted. Then in verses 39 to 41 he shows by an entirely different figure the glory of the resurrection body. All flesh is not the same—men, beasts, fishes, birds. All bodies are not the same—terrestrial, celestial. The glory of one is terrestrial, the other celestial. There is one glory of the sun, one of the moon, another of the stars. For one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. Hence how beautifully St. Paul blends the two figures to answer the question, How are the dead raised and with what body? “It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory,” &c.

Our author shows his mental conflict, but still swayed by his system, cavils, then yields. Page 179 he says: “Some make much account of the relative in this comparison. Not another body, we are told, but *it*, the same body. The grammatical construction would seem to imply this; but is it certain

that it was the meaning in the writer's mind? We doubt."

Then follows an ignoble struggle to prove his doubt or to darken the Apostle's only meaning. I only notice one point. "The contrast is between the body a man has before death, and the body he has after death. It, the body, he has before death, is corruptible. It, the body, he has after death, is incorruptible, they are not the same, but different. It is raised in incorruption." There is no point made at all. The Apostle tells us that they are not the same after death, and repeats it and emphasizes it, but he does say "it (the body) is sown in corruption; it (the body) is raised in incorruption." "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," *i. e.*, the sown, corruptible, weak, dishonored, natural body, is changed in the resurrection to an incorruptible, strong, honorable, spiritual body.

"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Behold, I show you a mystery. We shall not all (die) sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, &c.; and the dead shall be raised incorruptible. And with John Wesley I say, "Now, by this mortal and this corruptible can only be meant that body which we carry about with us, and shall one day lay down in the dust."—Sermon. And further, with Mr. Wesley we can say, "Let death prevail over and pull down this house of clay, since God hath undertaken to rear it up again, infinitely more beautiful, strong and useful." Raised incor-

ruptible! raised in power! raised in glory! Yes, this mortal shall put on immortality, "when mortality is swallowed up of life, and this vile body changed and made like his own glorious body." As the coarser elements are fused and changed into the sparkling diamond, so this corruptible body shall be made incorruptible and set in the crown of our mighty Redeemer, to sparkle and shine as the stars forever and ever. O, glorious resurrection! O, glorious material universe! Richter says that "An angel once took a man and stripped him of his flesh and lifted him up into space, to show him the glory of the universe. When the flesh was taken away the man ceased to be cowardly, and was ready to fly with the angel past galaxy after galaxy, and infinity after infinity," &c. Finally this fleshless man exclaims, "End is there none of the universe of God."

Come with me, not as a fleshless man; come with me, not as a spirit guide, but come with me as we all actually go sweeping through this universe. Look out from our flying ship as we sail out upon the universal sea of space. We turn our faces toward the sun, whose bright beams shed such a wonderful sea of material glory over us, that all nature is hid save this effulgence and our own ship. Ere we can examine the ship on which we sail, we turn our back upon the sun, and when her glory kisses the very clouds into gold, we begin to look out through the evening twilight upon the vast ocean of trackless ether, upon which we are sailing, and now thousands, yea, millions of ships like our own heave in sight, but lo! before

we have had time to hail our fellow sailors from the many beautiful ships, they begin to fade from sight, and the glorious king of day bursts upon our view. But our eyes have been opened to the immensity of the material universe, and on we sweep three hundred and sixty-five days until we make the magnificent sweep away, away round the sun, millions of miles.

Let us visit some of our neighboring ships that sail in our own fleet. Let us step over to a near ship, beautiful Venus, only twenty-six millions of miles away. Hail! thou fair goddess of the sea, what are thy dimensions and whither sailest thou? And we learn that this ship is nearly as large as our own and bound on the same voyage. Let us sail through that two hundred sail of asteroids, only stopping to note that they seem to sail as safely as though they were as large as the earth. Hail! Jupiter, thou king of gods! five hundred millions of miles away. Thou art a glorious ship. Our ship seems but a yawl-boat beside thy volume of thirteen hundred earths, and glorified by four kingly servants, clothed in red, yellow and blue, sweeping on around the sun in over eleven years on one voyage. O, beautiful emblem of the majesty of the material worlds! But we must not tarry. Hail, Saturn! We beg pardon for calling Jupiter the king of gods, for thou art far in his ascendancy. We bow at thy feet. Thy majesty overwhelms us; thy mighty form, thy glorious rings, thy eight moons revolving in ever-perfect obedience to thee, proclaim thy majesty is sublimity itself. Hail, Uranus! Hail, Neptune! Two billions of miles

away! How long is thy voyage? Over one hundred and sixty-four years around the sun!

Come with me as the comet rushes on from the sun for a thousand years out into space, and ask what worlds, what spheres! Come with me as the sun, with her accompanying fleet of ships, sails on her great voyage for a million years, and ask what mighty fleets are these that accompany us over this infinite sea! Hail, Arcturus! Hail, Polaris! Hail, thou mighty constellations of ships! Hail, thou voyagers over this unsounded sea! Whither goest thou? Art thou spirits? What is thy nature? Where is thy home? Whither wanderest thou? Tell me, oh thou infinite, unbounded, unknown and unknowable universe! "end of creation is there none?" yea, end of the beginning is there none? What is thy mission? Whence comest thou? If thou art but beastly, deaf and dumb! if matter in its highest formation is but beastly and idiotic! what art thou for? If man's body is but a clog, a curse, why the material universe? If God is a spirit, He cannot need the beastly matter. If angels are spirits, they cannot need idiotic matter. If man is a spirit, and only groans to be rid of matter, why, I ask, is the material universe? Do angels and pure spirits need cities with streets and mansions? Is not vacated space without a throbbing atom of idiotic matter enough for them?

If the law of all material nature is to live a season and then die, as our author maintains; if it was intended that man should die, why was he created such a being? Why allied to matter? Why God's spirit

breathed into matter? Had the angelic race proven a failure? And in order to improve the race, spirits were put into mud machines to improve them, or why this race struggle and awful tragedy?

If the material universe is so "ignoble, idiotic, beastly;" if the human body is but a helpless machine, only a quantity of oxygen and other gases, and only for a temporary cage, instrument, which is a clog, burden, hindrance, and must soon be shed as a snake sheds his skin, left in the grave never to rise, why was our author's precious angel baby put into such a mud machine, cage, and encumbered by such a clog? If this cage is such a prison, so beastly and idiotic, why not let it be a beast, and die and be buried like other beasts. Why put a "pure," sweet, "beautiful" angel baby, "after fifteen days," into this beastly little animal? Yes, if the body is such a beastly, sickly, lazy, good-for-nothing little cur, why force the heavenly innocent into such foul company?

Our author admits that this beastly body is necessary for a time, and that the spirit is to a large extent dependent upon it (page 107; also page 253), "At first bodies are indispensable." "Bodies serve as material shrines in which to posit souls," &c., &c.

But why angels should be posited or planted of necessity in mud cell's, we fail to see. Is this the way God bred angels in the first place? Is it a necessity of spirit that it be posited in a mud cell as a germ? "*Great Conscience!*" Why spirits—good, pure, angel babies—should be compelled to be propagated in an idiotic beast, I would like to know. What relation

has a pure spirit to a clog, a cage; and if needed to begin with, how does our author know they will not forever need one? How does he know that he may finally take Gabriel's place? Oh, what folly! O, how I faint for a cooling draught from the fountain of truth! "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when we shall appear, we shall be like him."—I John, 3:2.

No! no! It is all wrong! The glory of this material universe is not understood. I turn my back to none in faith in the spiritual kingdom of God, but I believe that the material kingdom of God is for a purpose. And while it may sink below the glory of the spiritual, yet it rises into the infinities above the human mind to conceive. And I believe the Divine Man, the Emanuel by whose word all things material were made when he shall have brought forth his accomplished work and put the last finishing touch upon the material cosmos from every blazing comet down to the lily of the valley, which he has clothed in more glory than Solomon, there will rise a shout of glory not much less than the song of the pure spirits of the spiritual kingdom. Others may degrade our bodily nature, but never while Christ reigns on the throne of the universe in his bodily presence will I consent to ignore the resurrected, glorified humanity. While he reigns as the slain lamb who was dead but lives again, and has been exalted far above all principalities or powers, "Who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in

all things He might have the pre-eminence." And while not only the redeemed in heaven give Him glory equal to the Father, but "ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of angels" gather round His throne, and from Gabriel down through principalities and powers bow in humble obeisance, and lay their crowns at His feet while they sing "with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing and honor, and glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and forever."

Never, never will I consent to believe the human body is beastly, idiotic and dumb. No, it is only by sin that the body, soul and spirit have been degraded; which degradation is seen in every part of the human nature, and short-sighted indeed must that one be who cannot read the story of the fall in every lineament of his nature, more forcibly seen, perhaps, in the physical, but alas! wonderfully evident in the mind, and even in the very spirit, whence cometh anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, fornication, uncleanness, murders, deceit, backbitings, hate of God, pride, disobedience to parents, but from the "vain imaginations and the foolish heart."—Rom. 1:21. Who would trace those red blotches, the crimson nose, the blear eye, to the body alone? Who doesn't know that

when the devil is cast out, and the poor unfortunate sits at the Master's feet, that the poor body also rises from its degradation? Will any say that the whole manhood of a Bunyan is not converted when from the low, beastly body, soul and spirit, he rises by the divine life implanted within to the sublime heights of a redeemed human being? And will our Christianity leave the body down? Yea, can it be left down while the soul and spirit rise? No, it cannot. See the seraphic Enoch after 300 years' walking with God; how sweet, how heavenly; see he rises, rises, soul, body and spirit; how little the touch of the heavenly glory transfigures him into the prophecies of Him who is to be the first fruits from the dead. Look at saintly John; see a saintly Fletcher; see the saints coming forth from their long sleep when Jesus rises; see the ineffable change increases from glory unto glory by the divine power whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself; see, they become like His own glorious body.

Material nature ignoble! Look out upon nature as it pours its flood of light and glory from over the sea; see it glow in the sunset, and color in the rainbow, or sparkle in the eye and on the human cheek divine. Tune thy *Æolian* harp to the harmonies of the spheres. Wing thy flight on wings of electric fire, as rapid as thought. Who will define the emotions that thrill in the roving herd of the forest, the songsters of the groves, or the fishes of the sea? Who will measure the thrill of joy in the human nerve, even in a fallen nature? Come with me into the paradise of human

loves; sit by the rolling sea or by the babbling brook in nature's shady bowers; tell me the rapture that springs in Jacob's breast as he tends Laban's flocks, or sits on the moss-covered well and talks with his beloved Rachel, for the love he bears fourteen long, tedious years seems but a honeymoon. Tell me, ye despisers of material nature, the ennobling power of her emotions as Mozart, that being almost divine, as he sits by the side of his Rachel, and pours his great opera into her loving ear, until he is so thrilled and elevated that "Idomeneo" goes forth not only to conquer the family's willing consent to their union, but to conquer the world of song, and to give him a name above the sons of men. O, tell me not that the glory and rapture of this material nature is nothing.

Come with me into the inner circle of God's chosen ones; sit in the charmed company of the class-room; rise to the glory of the Mount of Transfiguration, and as bursting clouds of divine glory come overshadowing us, and heart speaks to heart, and eye to eye, and exclaim with Peter and millions of others down the ages, "Lord, it is good for us to be here."

Tell me that this body, glorified, spiritualized, changed after the similitude of Christ's glorious body, will be ignoble, beastly, idiotic? No! no!

And with St. Paul we can say (II Cor. 5:4): "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan; being burdened. (Yes, many burdens, both of body, soul and spirit; because of sin, not because of our body, &c.) Not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

"Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Yes, victory over, 1st, Sin, the sting of death. 2d, Over death. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." 3d, Over the grave. "O, grave, I will be thy destruction." "Death is swallowed up in victory." "O, death, where is thy sting? O, grave, where is thy victory?"

O, beautiful future! O, beautiful resurrection! O, beautiful city that hath foundations "whose builder and maker is God!" No trembling star, but the centre of the universe. Lighted by the glory of God. Most precious; clear as electricity. O, city of great proportions, of jasper walls, of gates of pearl! Thy foundations garnished with precious stones, of jasper, of sapphire, of chalcedony, of emerald, of sardonyx, of sardius, of chrysolyte, of beryl, of topaz, of chryso-prasus, of jacinth, of amethyst! Thy streets paved with pure gold as clear as glass. O, beautiful city that needs no candle or temple, for the Lord God and the Lamb are thy temple and thy light! Thy rivers are pure water which flow out from beneath the throne of God and of the Lamb, whose sloping banks are shaded by the trees of life. Thy streets are not only paved with gold, but bestudded in the centre and on either side with trees that bear all manner of fruits.

O, lovely city, thy end shall never come! Earthly cities shall rise and fall; suns and earths shall crumble and fade, and new spheres shall roll forth in everchanging glory, but thy years change not, and thou, oh, inhabitant of this beloved city, thy portion

shall be glorious. There shall be no curse. There shall be no night of sorrow. Tears are all wiped away. Nothing shall enter to defile or corrupt, and only those can enter who have their names written in the Lamb's book of life.

Who is this that sits high upon Thy everlasting throne? And being turned, I saw Thy golden throne encircled in light as of the seven electric motors of the universe. And amidst this light most glorious I saw seated on the throne the Lamb of God as He had been slain, like unto the Son of Man, clothed in a garment of kingly beauty. His head and his hair were white as snow, and his eyes were as a great flame of fire, and his face shone above the brightness of the sun. And he spoke with a voice above the voice of the ocean or many thunders, saying: "I am Alpha and Omega. I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore."

Jerusalem, my happy home,
Name ever dear to me;
When shall my labors have an end
In joy and peace in thee?

When shall these eyes thy heaven-built walls
And pearly gates behold;
Thy bulwarks with salvation strong,
And streets of shining gold?

O, when, thou city of my God,
Shall I thy courts ascend,
Where congregations ne'er break up
And Sabbaths have no end?

Jesus, why cannot I follow thee now? "Thou shalt follow me afterwards." "I go to prepare a place for you." "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne." "Father, I will that my disciples be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory."

Who are these before the throne robed in white garments? These are they who have come up out of great tribulation and washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, hence are they before the throne serving and praising him in his temple. They hunger no more and thirst no more, not because they are spirits or angels, but because the Lamb feeds them and leads them to the living fountains of water. Ah! we, too, soon shall be there, not to take the place of angels, even the archangel Gabriel, but as the redeemed sons of God by the blood of the Lamb. "The first fruits of his resurrection are there, and they follow him whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb. And they sang a new song never heard before in heaven, Glory be to God and unto the Lamb." Thus "He being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation and became obedient unto death, wherefor God hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name above every name."

"The head that once was crowned with thorns
Is crowned with glory now ;
A royal diadem adorns
The mighty victor's brow.

“ Angels assist our mighty joys,
Strike all your harps of gold ;
And when you strike your highest notes,
His love can ne'er be told.”

Glory to God, I shall be like him; not like Gabriel, but like my divine Lord. “ We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.”—St. John.

“ We look for the Lord Jesus Christ who shall change our vile bodies that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.”—St. Paul.

“ We shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump.” “ This mortal must put on immortality.”—St. Paul.

“ I am the resurrection and the life.” “ I have the keys of death and the grave.”—Jesus.

“ The rising God forsakes the tomb,
In vain the tomb forbids him rise;
Cherubic legions guard him home,
And shout him welcome to the skies.”

O, glorious city, glorious inheritance, incorruptible, and fadeth not away. O, glorious throne; O, mighty King of kings and Lord of lords!

O, blessed humanity, “ glorified with Christ!” O, Jesus of Gethsemane, of Pilate's hall! O, Christ of Golgotha's trembling summit! O, voluntary sorrow and woe! Jesus of the new-made grave! Thou hast conquered. From Olivet's brow I see Thee rise. Thou art the glorified one. I shall die with Thee; I shall rise with Thee; I shall reign with Thee. “ Glori-

fied with Christ!" O, suffering ones! shall we not suffer on, knowing that

"They that suffer with their Master here
Shall soon before his sight appear,
And by his side sit down.
To patience, faith, the prize is sure,
And all that to the end endure
The cross shall wear the crown.
Thrice blessed bliss, inspiring hope,
It lifts the fainting spirit up,
And brings to life the dead."

O, rapture infinite! O, bliss divine! like Thee, oh Thou living, resurrected Jesus, shall I shine like the stars forever and ever, changing from glory into glory; beautiful to-day, more beautiful to-morrow; happy to-day, more happy to-morrow. Abel, Enoch, Samuel, David, Elijah, John, Paul, Luther, Wesley, mother, father, Eva, Sally, Edith, art thou there? My mother, my father, my children there in thy spirits, robed in thy resurrected bodies? Yes, I see thee all there; the same bodies, only glorified; yes, that is the same voice; I hear it now, oh, so sweet! How fair thy brow; how bright thine eyes; how fragrant thy lips. No more tears; no more pain; no more death; no night; no old age; no aching heart and throbbing brow. O, thou wert lovely on earth, in thy weakness and pain; how our hearts broke when you left us; but oh, how lovely now! What crowns; what palmy sceptres; what smiles wreath thy face; what songs float over the hills away, and echo in my soul. Sing on; shout

on; rise nearer and nearer thy Saviour; I'll meet thee soon; I am drawing nearer; I'll soon meet thee in our family mansion. O, sufferers with Jesus, weep not with those who have no hope. "They that suffer with him shall be glorified together." "They that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

It is revealed that they are not angels or pure spirits, but like their divine Master, men and women redeemed from sin, death, hell and the grave. And we do not go down to the grave, as our author would have us, "dreading to go, our faith struggling with terrors of death, our frames shivering as our feet enter the cold river, out into the pitiless tempest." No, no! I am ready to be offered; a crown awaits me, shouted St. Paul. I see the heavens opened, said the martyr Stephen, and his face shone as an angel's. "The best of all God is with us." "O for a gust of praise to go to the end of the earth." "I am happy as I can be on earth, and as sure of glory as if I were already in it." "I know I am dying, but my deathbed is a bed of roses. I die a safe, easy, happy death. Precious Jesus! Glory, glory be to God!" "There is now nothing but peace, sweetest peace."

"How hard it is to die!" remarked a friend to an expiring believer. "Oh, no! no!" he replied. "Easy dying! Glorious dying!" Looking up to the clock, he said: "I have experienced more happiness in dying two hours this day than in my whole life. It is worth a whole life to have such an end as this. Oh! I never thought that such a poor worm as I could come to such a glorious death."

This is the way Christians die. This is the victory that is vouchsafed unto the believers in old-fashioned Methodism who believe in Jesus as their life and resurrection. And if our author has nothing better than doubts and fears, shivering out in the pitiless storm, we don't care to accept his teaching.

"O, death, where is thy sting ;
O, grave, where is thy victory."

FOURTH INCONSISTENCY.

It seems inconsistent to me for an author of so much ability, and upon so important a subject, to fail to note the difference between the body, *per se* the *soma*, and the present human form thereof, viz: flesh and blood; especially since he so often uses them as if they were one and the same; and also since the Bible makes the distinction plain enough for all intents and purposes; *e. g.*, I Cor. 15:50: "Flesh (*sarx*) and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." I Cor. 15:35: "And with what body (*soma*) do they come?" Eph. 5:23: "And he is the saviour of the body" (*soma*). And nowhere is it said the body cannot inherit the kingdom, or is unholy.

Our author fails to differentiate between the *soma*, the body, the physical nature as constituting the living, breathing, thinking, personality, and the elements that this personality uses in the present form. Hence he says (page 182): "I wish to put on record here that, for myself, there is nothing in any particle of flesh or blood that ever belonged to my body that

creates in me the least desire to ever see it again." If he had stopped here he would have been consistent. Who ever had a desire to gather up the blood that ran from the nose in childhood, or to carry to heaven the curls cut off when mother wept? No one ever wrote such a desire, or would gather up the old effete matter thrown off particle by particle. But now he leaves the subject of flesh (*sarx*) and speaks of the body (*soma*): "This body of earthly matter I am perfectly willing to put off, that I may put on one that will answer the higher ends of my existence better. 'That body which I look for, the resurrection body.'" Now, while St. Paul says: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," he also says: "God giveth to every seed his own body."

Now, if our author had seen the difference between the flesh and blood, components of the body which were temporary, changing, corruptible, while the body is a personality, a *someone*, and not simply a somewhat, unchanging and naturally undying, he would not have fallen into this error.

Again (page 52): "My body had changed and many times vanished away, but I abided. The years had driven me from house to house time and again, but they had not impaired me. That which abides is a spirit. Bodies change and die, only spirit remains."

This is beautiful rhetoric but false reasoning. While every beating pulse makes a change in the constituent elements of the body, the constituent remains the same, and that constituent is not a spirit, but a man of body, soul and spirit, and the body is

the same even as the soul and spirit are the same all along from the cradle to the grave. I have no more lost my body than I have lost my soul or spirit. The fact that it has changed argues no more for another body than that I have another soul or spirit because my soul and spirit have changed from the boyhood thoughts, emotions and conscience through the various stages until now. "Man became a living being," not a dying being, and if he had not sinned he would not have died. True the flesh and blood, the constituted elements of his body, would have changed, thus giving the living being chance to expand and grow through all the stages of his earthly life, until his earthly development had finished and he was ready for his mansion amid the unsullied glories of his heavenly home; and instead of death, like Enoch and Elijah he would have soared in his glorified nature to brighter realms beyond the sky. And I believe that some day death itself shall be destroyed; and as the worm rises a butterfly, so man shall rise without death to his heavenly environments, to the blood-washed throng in the house not made with hands above. If our author had rightly looked in the mirror of his own conscious self he would have said, What a change! My body has wonderfully changed; I can hardly believe that I am the same; but these are the same eyes that my father looked into, these the same lips my mother kissed, these the same hands that held the plow. Changed? Yes, but not more than they saw taking place since first I cooed on my mother's breast till I left the old homestead. There is

the same scar that I received from a fall when but three years old.

My mind or soul, my thinker, can it be the same? Can this be the same mind that my mother taught the a, b, c? Is this the same mind after fifty years of thought and study and travel and experience? Yes, but oh, how changed. Yes, but it is the same, and side by side hangs the picture of my sainted mother, and the picture of my last boy that I laid away in the tomb.

My spirit is the same, but not the less changed, Alas! is there a change here also; is there no spot but is changed since I last heard the cooing dove? Our author says: "Bodies change, only spirit remains." Alas! my brother, the spirit changes too; look deeper, brother. Has there no change come over thy spirit since then; has there come no sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost; has not thy pride and worldly ambition been ennobled; has not thy fifty years of care and sorrow, thy toil and suffering, thy sacrifices and service, thy fellowship with other spirits wrought no change? Is it true that only thy hair is whitened and thy form lost some of its elasticity? Ah! thou hast changed, but thou art the same—the same body, soul and spirit.

So, also, my dear Bishop Foster, there awaits you another change. "This mortal shall put on immortality." "This corruptible shall put on incorruption." "Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." And not only the body will thus be changed, but your

mind also, for when you see your body that has served you so long and well these seventy years not left at the gate, but clothed upon with immortality, glowing and sparkling in immortal youth, all weakness gone, all shame gone, all corruption gone forever, and the dear old body that we all love, changed and fashioned like unto His glorious body, and when mother and father, and wife and children recognize the same boy, and husband and father come home, not to the old farm and homestead, but to the heavenly mansion that eternally shall stand, then I am sure your mind will be so changed that you will have as much difficulty to recognize it as you will your body. And with the Apostle "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

FIFTH INCONSISTENCY.

One of the greatest inconsistencies of our author is the inconsiderateness with which he assails the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church. If the doctrines of our church need the services of a physician, they should receive the stroke of an expert in the lines of its necessities, and that after a thorough and judicious consultation of the ablest doctors of the church. When a patient is diseased in some of the vital organs, the quack may cut in the dark regardless of the consequences; but the true and skilled physician, after long and painful thought and consultation. Hence I say that for so ripe a thinker our

author is inconsistently inconsiderate in plunging his reckless knife into the very vitals of the church. Hear him, for example, on page 16 :

"However it may awaken surprise, truth demands that we should make the confession that we do not know that death does not end all." "If there are any who imagine that they know, we are not anxious to dispossess them of the pleasing delusion—it cannot harm them." Can a stab like that be thrust into the very vitals of conscious assurance with anything but a disastrous effect? Palliate the wound after the bloody blade is withdrawn all you please, anoint it with salve and bind it carefully as you may, the stab is but the thrust of a quack.

Page 19: "Continued difference and disputation should not discourage us. In the nature of the case this is inevitable. Each mind must act for itself, and as new minds are constantly coming into the arena, the old questions must be fought over in each age, . . . and so each mind must renew the combat. There is no other way. Let the glorious fight go on! The sturdier the blows the better for truth." Is it consistent for a great man to write thus? Can any one fail to see the fallacy that covers the half truth? True, each mind must fight out his own battles; no one thoughtful mind will allow any other mind to think wholly for him; but is it true therefore, we are to have no standard of truth to which each mind can come to compare? Shall each man set his watch by his own eye when he supposes the sun is in the meridian? "Let the glorious fight go on! The sturdier the

blows the better for truth;" true, but shall it be a mob fight in which no system shall be observed? Shall Bishop Colenso strike at the atonement, Bishop Foster at the resurrection, Dr. Thomas at future punishment, each grasping their own flag rush pell mell into the fray?

No. Let everything be done in order. We fight not a mob, but an organized army of principalities and powers, and we must be as thoroughly an organized army as the foe. Christ is our great captain, "and he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the church."—Eph. 4:11, 12.

We are not a mob, every one striking out for himself. No, there is another way; that is the way laid down by the Apostle for "the perfecting of the saints." The church should be a thoroughly organized army, and one of its first duties is to see to the discipline of the army. Who doesn't know the importance of discipline? Mr. Wesley said: "The Methodists must take heed to their discipline." True, each mind must strike for himself, but he must strike the proper thing; he must not strike his friend; he must not spike his own guns, or blow up his own magazine; he must strike, but it must be his enemy. Hence the Bishop's vow contains among other things, I will carefully guard the church from heresies and all strange doctrines. And when a Bishop fails to keep his ordination vows, but instead blows up the magazine, is he not a traitor to his church? Will any sentimentalism

about each man striking for himself excuse such Arnoldism?

If our author, in investigating truth for himself, finds out that the standards of his church are untenable; if he finds out after careful, prayerful, and thorough study, that Mr. Wesley, Watson, Dr. Clark, and the great standard writers of the church are in the wrong, and he cannot agree with them, but finds himself in disagreement, what is his plain duty? Is it to go to work to overthrow those standards by preaching before large bodies of ministers and laymen; by throwing the weight and force of his position in writing a book and stamping it with the seal of our great publishing house? No; every impulse of our manhood is insulted. Every principle of right is ignored. Elevated to rank and power, clothed with authority, and when with sceptre full in hand, instead of driving away strange, heretical enemies, he willfully stabs the church from his high and powerful position; and standing in that high and sheltered place, bids defiance to his critics. Even claiming that "there is unbecoming impatience and even intolerance of discussion," what show have I, without money, or influence, or patronage, to attack such an armored giant, sheltered behind a thousand rifled cannon, high upon his impregnable throne of a deathless episcopacy? But, David conquered Goliath; Luther defeated the Pope; so, by God's help, this giant shall not go free. See page 23: "We consign the quickly decaying form to the grave. We know that it soon moulders to dust. There is not a single sign that it will ever re-

turn to life. To believe that it will, on any facts which appear on any rational ground within our reach, is impossible." Again (161): "The affection the soul has for the body, and the consequent disappointment it would feel at having it displaced by another, is a fond imagination—delusion. Let us cease to be the sport of dreams and slave of prejudices." I say that these inconsiderate assertions which strike at the very vitals of our doctrines, with which the book abounds, are *inconsistent*. Doctrine, discipline, well-defined standard of truths by which the Christian Church is held into a great combination against a combined, united foe, is of the first importance. There can be no successful fight against error, maintained only as lovers of truth combine on common bases of general truth, and clasping hands present a united front to the enemy; and thus like the united sands of the sea-shore, from their united bases beat every roaring wave into foam. Without this united, solid basis of union, all truths would be whirled about as the sands in the tides of the sea. If any finds himself unable to thus clasp hands in this holy union, it were more manly for him to plunge alone into the surging breakers than to try to hold his position and to destroy the foundation on which others rest. And if he lacks that manly courage to take a cold bath, it is infinitely better that the church see that his place is filled by one who holds these common truths in beautiful symmetry with the rest. And as but one song is heard from shore to shore, so we shall continue to hear, "I

believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord," &c.

Last year I was in the midst of an earnest fight in Camden, N. J., with the Unitarian preacher. After months of conflict in which it appeared to me I had the clear advantage, although both of the daily papers were in full sympathy with the Unitarian, judge my surprise one Monday morning to read nearly a column in the *Post*, headed "A Pastor's Experience; his own opinions and those of Rev. Dr. Curry." At Unity church, Sunday night, Rev. William M. Gilbert, the pastor of the Unitarian church in Vineland, but formerly of the Methodist Episcopal ministry, gave his "One Year's Experience Outside the Orthodox Fold." Mr. Gilbert made this statement about the late Rev. Dr. Daniel Curry, at one time the editor of the New York "Christian Advocate" (a Methodist Episcopal organ): In January of 1884, Dr. Curry was present at a Methodist preachers' meeting in Chicago, and made some remarks on the "Higher Criticism of the Bible." One of the preachers present made a stenographic report of the utterances of the doctor and afterwards wrote them out in full, and is willing to take oath as to their accuracy as given in the Boston "Christian Register" of February 14, 1884, from which I quote: Then followed a quarter column of flings at the Old Testament like the following—"But, we are now standing on the eve of the most stupendous revolution in reference to the doctrines of the Bible that the church has ever known. Uncertainty

and doubt are pressing upon us." "The Old Testament abounds with ten thousand old wives' fables, which will finally drop out as a tadpole loses its tail." "When you have to give up what your mother taught you, do it honestly." "I am awfully shy of the Old Testament." "These words of Dr. Curry," said Mr. Gilbert, "were uttered soon after he had finished revising Clark's commentaries, and hence he was unusually familiar with Biblical literature."

What was I to do? Not another pastor of the other twenty-five evangelical churches uttered a word. Here was hurled into my face a statement from the venerable editor and scholar whose pen had just fallen from his palsied hand.

True, the "Christian Advocate" had a dozen lines in an editorial, saying that Dr. Curry had denied the accuracy of the report, &c., from which I made the best reply I could, and sent to the people of Camden, through the press. Then follows another half column from Mr. Gilbert, in which he says, among other things: "There is no attempt to tell what Dr. Curry did say," &c. I only relate this bit of actual history to enforce this point. "Our author is inconsistent in his inconsiderate assaults of fundamental truth." I am sure he has said enough in "Beyond the Grave" to make polished arrows for a thousand quivers for skeptics of various kinds. I know Dr. Curry was a firm believer in our holy Christianity, and probably did not say all that was charged to him. But do we not know "that prudence is the better part of valor?" Are we not to avoid the very appearance of evil? Do we

not know that the flying pieces from a bursting shell may kill more than the solid ball? Do we not know that simple negations and random slings may be turned into shafts of deadly agencies? If, when we stand for the faith once delivered to the saints, we are to have polished shafts hurled at us from the heads of our own church, what can we do? I for one feel that this kind of destructive criticism has gone far enough in our own church, and if we must not only meet the German, the French, and other outside rationalism, but from our own church leaders have these things hurled at us, we may well despair. If the fundamental doctrines need revising, let us do it in a systematic way. Let a convention of evangelical Christians be called, and, as in the past, doctrines have been formulated, so let us now be equal to the emergency; but until then it is to be supposed the church teaches the truth, and the only manly way is to teach in accord with the acknowledged standards of the church or to withdraw from her positions of influence and power. But to stand behind her pulpits and to live upon her bounty, and therein receive almost the only power to harm her, and under cover of that position try to overthrow the very foundations on which she is built, is all wrong. That there is any considerable demand for any fundamental change, I doubt; on the other hand I believe the mass of the people are satisfied, and except in some further development and illustration of the old doctrines, they look as young and beautiful in the light of the nineteenth as of the first century.

SIXTH INCONSISTENCY.

Our author's sixth inconsistency consists in his unreasonable exaltation of reason. If I am correct in my judgment of Bishop Foster, this inconsistency marks his life fallacy; *i. e.*, he is, in a modified sense, a rationalist. He elevates reason above its legitimate sphere, which must of necessity lead into constant difficulty. The rationalist demands more from reason than it can possibly give. The Romanist denies to reason its proper function, hence they must both inevitably be defective or erroneous. He that refuses to put every proposition through the most rigid process of reason, is liable at every step to be deceived. Is it reasonable? is a proper question of a rational being, and even then we must recognize the fact of our liability to error, for the best human judgment is fallible. The Romanist follows blindly the leadership of authority, ignoring reason. The rationalist follows the leadership of reason, ignoring authority and experience. Is it not evident that these are both wrong, and that either course is liable to great evil?

Our author evidently has followed reason so servilely that he has made a life failure in the realm of Christian thought; and nowhere is this fact shown better than in "Beyond the Grave." He says, on page 13, chapter I, at the very beginning: "The subject I am to treat is 'Life Beyond the Grave.' There are three possible methods of conducting the discussion. These are :

"First. To assume everything, and give wing to imagination and feeling (*what a discussion*).

"Second. To treat it exegetically, as purely a doctrine of revelation (and why is it not purely a doctrine of revelation?)

"Third. To submit it to the reason, and examine it in the light of all the facts bearing upon it which lie within the circle of our intelligence."

Now, if he means anything by announcing these three methods, he certainly means to submit "life beyond the grave" to the reason, for he says below: "Aiming at the best and most permanent results, we adopt the third method." He is not to conduct the discussion by the first or second methods, but by the third. Hence, can we expect anything but confusion? "Life beyond the grave," not by imagination and feeling, not exegetically, as purely a doctrine of revelation, but submit it to the reason. Now let me ask, what has reason to do with "life beyond the grave?" The imagination, the feelings, the Bible says there is "life beyond the grave;" but what has reason to say? What is the province of reason on such a question? Now, I submit that the only province of reason is to say it is reasonable or unreasonable that there is "life beyond the grave." "Reason, ratio, from *rerum ratio*, to reckon, believe, think." The reason does not know whether there is "life beyond the grave" or not, hence it cannot tell, and to ask it is similar to asking a blind man the color of a rose. Ask reason if it is probable, possible, reasonable, and it can and will an-

swer you ; but why ask it to tell you what it does not know. Hence, our author soon comes to the only legitimate answer that reason can possibly give, viz. (page 17): "We do not know that death does not end all." Here our author candidly admits his position. "We do not know," *i. e.*, we submit the question of "life beyond the grave" not to imagination or feeling, nor to revelation, but to reason; hence reason replies, I don't know; therefore our author can only say, "We do not know."

Here is the fallacy of the rationalist. A rationalist is one who is unreasonable in demanding of reason what it cannot give. The reasoning faculty in man is one of his noblest attributes, but it is not his only attribute. It is liable to all the weaknesses of the human mind, and its testimony is always to be received with great caution. For thousands of years the wise men said the sun, moon and stars all revolved around the earth. Reason looked up, and smiled, and gave assent. What has reason to do with "life beyond the grave?" Simply to act upon the reasonableness of the proposition. The proposition is submitted to the reason. Death does not end all. My imagination, my feelings, my innate consciousness, and my Bible say death is not my final overthrow. The office of reason is to weigh the evidence for and against the proposition, and in the light of all the facts give an answer as to its reasonable possibility or probability. To demand more of reason than this is rationalism. To accept less is credulity. These are the two dangerous extremes that have afflicted the

race, and which is the more dangerous is hard to tell. If our author had said, "life beyond the grave" is a question above the powers of the finite mind to comprehend; therefore I propose to examine the subject carefully, subjecting the imagination, the feelings, the innate consciousness and the claims of the Bible as a revelation upon that subject to the rigid test of reason, and to examine every fact or argument submitted thereto, to see if the proposition is reasonable, then he would have asked of reason a proper question. But in asking reason the direct question, reason, if true to its nature, could but reply, I don't know. Let our author add (*the evidence of*) after submit, and the proposition will be proper thus:

Third. "To submit (the evidence of) it to the reason and examine it in the light of all the facts bearing upon it which lie within the circle of our intelligence," and then he submits to reason its legitimate business.

Let us ask reason about "life in the moon," and can it answer other than, I do not know? Let us ask reason of the evidence of "life in the moon," and it will examine the arguments for and against, and answer, It is reasonable or unreasonable. So let us ask reason to examine the evidence of "life beyond the grave," and it will answer with a voice as loud as ten thousand thunders, "There is abundant evidence, while there are some things that would seem to prove that death ends all." Yet the arguments are ten to one that there is life beyond the grave. This is the mission of reason; here it ends on the question of

“life beyond the grave,” and he that goes no further can know no more. But we are not shut up to reason alone; thank God, He has not left us with only this faculty. The ear is a great and blessed faculty, but it cannot see the light, the beautiful world, or the stars, but the eye can. Still, the eye cannot taste and tell me the difference between the sweet or the sour apple, but the taste can; but the ear, the eye, the taste cannot tell the difference between the most fragrant garden, and the most noisom stench, but the nose can. The rationalist is one who goes around with closed eyes, complaining that there is no light or beauty; or plugged ears and finding no harmony; and chewing roses and finding no fragrance. Good Lord, deliver us from such inconsistency.

It is nothing against reason that it cannot answer the question, “Does death end all?” any more than it is against it that it cannot answer whether an apple is sweet or sour. I say to reason, Is that a sour apple? It can but answer, I don’t know. I ask, Is it reasonable that it is sour? and it may answer, yes, or no; but it cannot tell. Is that stick straight that looks crooked because it is thrust in the water? Do men walk across the rivers, bays, and sounds in the north? Is the earth flat, or round? Does the sun rise, wheel around the earth, and come back at sunrise? The reason can only answer as to the reasonableness, or unreasonableness, and wait for experiment. So, also, we must submit the evidence of the “life beyond the grave” as to its reasonableness to reason, and experimentally test the question as we do in all

questions submitted to the reason. I can soon tell whether the apple is sour. I can soon know whether men walk on the water in the north. I can soon tell whether the earth is round. So, also, I can know that "Death does not end all;" there is "life beyond the grave." How? Not by reason; but,

First. By my innate consciousness.

Second. By the teaching of Jesus Christ. Not to enter into the discussion of axiomatic, moral or first truths, I am safe in saying that this belief in a future "life beyond the grave" is so universal, all-pervasive of human thinking, that on the one denying this as true must fall the burden of proof. It may prove but the absolute need of a life beyond, while the second demonstrates beyond the possibility of doubt the fact that there is "life beyond the grave." I am free to admit that on the second proof must depend our assurance of the "life beyond the grave." While all men have felt the power and influence of the first, yet only the believer in Jesus Christ has entered fully into that immortality which was brought to light by the gospel of Christ.

The first may be compared to the physical hunger; the second to the spread table where the hunger is satisfied; hence salvation may be compared to a feast.

See that hungry man! What longing, what pain, what desire for food! See! he is at the table; how he eats, hardly looking up or speaking! He eats, not reasons! Thus the human heart is hungry. The human innate consciousness has hungered for soul food, and one of the essential longings was for life be

yond the grave. And one of the essential foods provided in the Lord's feast was immortality and eternal life. "I am the resurrection and the life." To this feast millions and millions of hungry souls have come, and, thank God, they have been filled with the bread of life. "I am the bread of life, he that eateth of me shall never hunger."

Here is the difficulty of our author's method, as with the rationalist. The gap between hunger and the supply can only be passed over by experiment. The hungry man may reason about hunger, its causes and cures, or about the reasonableness or unreasonableness of eating; he may ask many questions, raise many objections, show the whole process to be mysterious, but his hunger cannot be properly satisfied until he partakes of the food. Eating will satisfy his hunger.

Reason has to do with the reasonableness of the process. Faith in the food as being proper as to its nutritiousness, adaptability, comes in after reason has done its work; but the actual eating does the work.

So also with soul hunger; the human soul has an innate hunger after God, after peace, after life. "O, that I might know him." "How shall a man be just with his Maker?" "If a man die shall he live again?" This has been and is the universal cry of the human soul. Many tables have been spread. I do not say that Christianity is the only one that has food for this hunger, but I do say that "*Jesus Christ is the bread of life.*" Jesus said (John 6:33): "The bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world." "I am the bread of life." "I am the

living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever."

Behold then, and wonder. Soul hunger as broad as physical hunger; soul food as abundant as soul hunger. Can any man look into the open face of humanity and doubt the universal fact of soul hunger? Read it in the bloody altars, the lurid flames, the sacred rivers, the religious wars, the catacombs, the sacrifices of the martyrs, the cross and steeples of the Christian Church; yea, in the universal activity of unbelievers as well. Let each man look deep into his own soul and know this hunger, and ask, Shall God clothe the grass and the lily, feed the sparrow and supply bodily hunger and neglect the soul? "If ye, being evil, know how to supply your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father feed your soul, oh ye of little faith?" and then come to the wide-spread and abundant-laden table and be satisfied. "O, taste and see that the Lord is good."

"Except ye eat of my body and drink of my blood ye have no life in you." Eating is the only way to supply this great hunger. Our author's attempt to make reason the method is the mistake of the rationalist. Reason has its office, but can only examine the reasons for and against this table; it may lead to the table, but can never test the power of the food to supply the soul's demand. Yea, faith must step in and mediate between reason and the test; hence without faith it is impossible to eat. Reason has tested the authority and found some good, some indifferent. Yea, it has sought to understand how this food can supply

the soul, but after all it can only lead up to faith, which says, I will try and know. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." Reason or faith cannot test it; they are but the instruments by which the food is put in contact with the nature; and the food, and the food only, can satisfy the soul's hunger; hence the supreme test is in eating the bread of life.

Here, and here only is "The rock of offence and the stone of stumbling." "To the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness." "Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life," (John 5:40), is as true to-day as when spoken by Jesus Christ. Our author's submitting this food to the reason is unreasonable, and his assertion (page 15), "That it is even better to doubt than to assent, when the proof is not sufficient," is misleading. If the bread is musty, if you distrust the cook, it is better not to eat than to be poisoned, but if reason says there is nothing unreasonable about the food or the authority, then eat and be satisfied. So, also, come to this blessed Lord Jesus Christ, and in humble faith partake and live. But, says the objector, will this prove that there is life beyond the grave? Yes and no. It will prove to you that Jesus Christ has power to supply the soul's hunger for God and peace, and this hunger supplied, you will be in position to see the life beyond death.

Let me illustrate. I live in the tropics, I have never seen ice. A neighbor goes north, and returning tells me that he saw men walk over the rivers and bays on ice (*i. e.*, on the water); in the north the water becomes hard on top and they walk and drive teams over it.

There is no bridge or boats. The water simply becomes hard, you can see through it to the bottom. Reason says that is reasonable or unreasonable. My neighbor is rather of a doubtful character; I doubt. A hundred neighbors go and return bearing the same story, and some of these are men of undoubted reliableness; and while reason remains the same, faith says it must be true. Unbelief says it is unreasonable; I won't believe. A thousand men go, bearing the same story; still unbelief says it is contrary to nature; the idea is preposterous. This man believes more in himself than in a thousand other men. There are a few such men in regard to the power of Jesus Christ to save the soul from soul hunger. They are what the Scriptures terms "men wise in their own conceit." "Heady," "high-minded," "Professing themselves to be wise, they become fools." "I submit it to the reason," says the proud rationalist and our author, and it is unreasonable and I don't care for your testimony. I have not touched or tasted, heard or seen it; therefore I won't accept it. Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners. To save them from sin and moral oughtness, soul-hunger; to save them from wrath and give them peace of conscience. One, two; yea, a thousand, ten thousand; yes, millions, testify that He is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; and yet our "wise" rationalistic doubter objects and says, It is unreasonable; I'll not receive this testimony. Now what is to be done? He won't go and see and know for himself, neither will he accept the evidence of millions of the

best men in the world, upon whom he sees the power in their own lives changing them from low, groveling, drunken lives to the noblest. The only thing to do is to leave him alone in his glorious shame. But would it not be more reasonable for him to say, Although it looks unreasonable for men to walk on water and over bays and rivers, yet it is more unreasonable for me to put my judgment against the evidence of these hundreds of good men who have been north and testify unanimously to the fact; hence, he says, it must be true, but his knowledge is only the knowledge of faith, which is above reason and is only reasonable because it is testified to by evidence that makes doubt unreasonable; hence, the unreasonableness of rationalism when it refuses to accept the testimony of millions of intelligent, unbiased, cultivated men that Jesus Christ hath power on earth to save. Now, suppose this resident of the tropics wishes to know experimentally of this wonder, he must go and test for himself, and when he walks above the sweeping tide and looks through his glassy pavement at its swelling eddies he may feel his head swim, but a few steps and all is over. So, thank God, he who accepts Christ by faith and comes unto his throbbing, loving heart, may stand for the moment bewildered, but a few steps and all is over, and the soul finds its true centre and cries out, "My Lord and my God." "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "He that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." "I am the way."

"*I am the truth.*" "I am the door." "I am the life." "I am the bread and the water of life." The rationalist submits Christ to the reason, rejecting the testimony of others and stands alone. The orthodox worldling accepts the testimony of the ages, but refuses to experiment for himself and only knows by faith. The Christian believer accepts Christ and knows for himself, and then all hell cannot dispossess him of his demonstrated knowledge; hence, Paul exclaims, "*I know whom I have believed,*" II Tim. 1:12; *i. e.*, I believe in Christ, I now know him personally. My faith knowledge has been verified by experiment. Hence, we say, submit the proposition to the crucible of reason, and when it has passed judgment submit it to faith, and then for its complete confirmation test it by actual experiment, and we have the trinity that makes a blessed unity.

Thus Munsell says (Psychology, page 151): "Faith thus stands as a sentinel at the door of the *inner*, and in a certain sense, higher functions of the soul, to guard the citadel from the intrusion of open or secret foes. Faith, therefore, is the highest, as it is the ultimate, product of human thought, the end to which all intellection tends, and in which it terminates. To men accustomed to sound the praises of *reason* and to underrate *faith* as childish, it may seem a lame and impotent conclusion, that faith is not only the rational, but the only possible condition of human activity; but so it is. . . . The term faith, or belief, is here used as the true generic representative of the product of reason in its ultimate evolution, and includes every con-

dition from the slightest preponderance of probabilities to the absolute certainty of mathematical demonstration." Now, submit the proposition of our author, "Life Beyond the Grave,"

1st. To reason. And as I have shown it can only examine its reasonableness, and answer more or less clearly that in lieu of all the evidence the facts show that it is possible, probable or even very hopeful.

2d. Faith takes up this ultimate of reason, and says there is life beyond the grave; and as we cannot demonstrate until death, we are shut up to faith knowledge until the time when we shall be able to go over the river of death. Reason says, I don't know; but a rational faith says, I do know. "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God."—II Cor. 4:1.

Now let us say to our southern friends: In the north men not only walk on the water, but they take this very same water and preserve their killed meats for weeks, and months, and years. Our rationalist friend says I have submitted it to reason, and it don't tell me that it is true, therefore I don't believe it is true. It may be or it may not be true; in fact I don't believe there is such a thing as water being hard enough to bear a team across the river; but the friend which believed his neighbors, and went north, and walked on the icy rivers, says, I believe the proposition; I admit it looks unreasonable that meats should be kept from decay by ice, when it is natural for it to decay and spoil; but it is not more unreasonable or above my reason than the other proposition, and I

proved that to be true by experiment, and I know that if these men testify that it is true, that it must be true. Thus I come to the proposition "life beyond the grave."

The human heart hungers after God, peace and eternal life. Jesus Christ comes and offers peace with God, pardon, justification to every one that believes. Reason says it may or it may not be true; and our rationalist friend says, I don't believe in Christ, hence he stays in the dark. I say to him, Millions of human souls have tried and found it true; if you will come by faith, which is higher than reason, you may know; but he refuses to come to demonstrate or test, hence he does not nor can he know. The believing friend accepts the rational testimony of others, believes and comes to Christ, and finds pardon and peace demonstrates His power to save. This same Jesus Christ declares that there is "life beyond the grave." "Jesus said unto Martha, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." "I am the life." "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." He raised the dead before a nation of witnesses. He arose himself after being dead and buried.

Does death end all? Reason says, I don't know; it may, or it may not; possibly it may, possibly not; probably it may, probably not. There are many difficulties in the way; there are many things that indicate life beyond. Faith says, I know that death does

not end all. The rationalist, demanding more of reason than it can give, and refusing it the right to turn him over to the realm of faith, says, Reason does not know, therefore, I do not know. Faith says, Reason does not know, and it has no proof that death does end all, and has many reasons why it may not ; and I have more than reasons, I know that death does not end all ; there is life beyond the grave.

Faith says, I believed my neighbors about the ice of the north, I tested by going and investigating ; now these same worthy witnesses testify that ice preserves meats from decay and I know their evidence is worthy, for I have tested it and know. Jesus Christ promised me salvation from sin and fear. I believed him, and went to Him and found Him true. Now, He tells me again, that there is "life beyond the grave," and I know Him, I know His evidence is true, I know He rose from the dead, I know He promised to give me eternal life, hence, I know that death does not end all. Hence, the apostle Paul, in Rom. 5, says: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. ; *i. e.*, faith (not reason) led him to Christ for salvation. *Peace, joy, hope* following inevitably. Therefore, verse 10, "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." I know Christ as my Saviour, and the greater includes the less. I know Him and to know Him is eternal life. Hence, I know death does not end all, not only by the evidence of the Scriptures' thoroughly established testimony, but

by my faith in Him whom I have found absolutely trustworthy. He lives beyond the grave. He is the first fruits from the grave, and as the farmer knows from the first fruits that the harvest will come, so I know by his resurrection I shall live. Thus we have an answer to the question, Does death end all? positive and clear in the negative. True, not by a sense perception for none of us have been dead, except in swoons like Rev. Wm. Tennett. Not necessarily by a deduction of reason, but by, 1st. The life, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ well and truly handed down to us by indubitable witnesses, and by, 2d. A personal knowledge of Him in his power to save, "whom to know is eternal life."

We do not ignore reason, we ask it for all it has. We add to its ultimatum faith in the rational evidence and the experimental assurance of Christ Jesus, and we add to that the witness of God's spirit which "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God, and if children then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ, that we may be glorified together."—Rom. 8: 16, 17. Now add to this a conscientious life. If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine, and we have a knowledge that is superior to any other knowledge, and can and does lift the soul above the maybe so, the guess work, the jugglery of priests, "the misgivings, doubts and fears" of our rationalistic author. I have a conscious knowledge of the life of Jesus in my soul, and am as sure of my heavenly title as any earthly possession.

This knowledge does not and cannot come by our author's third method. Reason is but the one faculty. Faith and works, or an experience in divine things, must work together. Here is the trouble with all rationalists. They refuse in divine things to follow up reason to its legitimate fruit—faith, and then follow faith through its own glorious path to the coveted goal of full experimental assurance or conscious knowledge.

This is the trouble, and the sooner they, as well as Christian teachers, fully understand it, the better for the race. We ask no unreasonable thing; we ask only what is granted in our every day life and in every department of human intelligence. We perceive the proposition, we reason and form judgments, we fear the evil and hope for the good, we believe for the good and push on our experiments until they are realized in our conscious possessions. In rejecting this only sensible course, rationalism deserves the condemnation of all sensible men as well as that of God, and we are forced to the only sensible conclusion with Christ that "This is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."—John 3:19. "Ye will not come unto me." "Professing themselves to be wise, they become fools." "Trust your reason, we have been told, till we are tired of the phrase, and you will become atheists or agnostics. We take you at your word; we become agnostics."—*Leslie Stephen*. All right, you are a free moral agent; go on. If you want to be a tramp, we cannot help it,

while you do not become amenable to the law. To refuse is the option of the human will. God has done his part. "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it."—Isa. 5:4. What has God left undone? Why cannot these great intellects grasp the truth? Where is the difficulty? Is God at fault? Is it not well to pause here? Why need we labor like Prof. Drummond so prodigiously that these giants may know the way and yet remain in the dark? Does it require such deep learning, such acute reasoning faculties? Does not the way seem plain? Cannot it be understood by the "way-faring man, though a fool?" Is the food placed so high that the humblest cannot reach it? What then is to become of the great throbbing heart of humanity? What of the millions of unlettered men, women and children of the uncultured and unfortunate race? Pause, ye Christian philosophers, and answer this fundamental question.

Listen, then, to the Master's answer: "*Ye will not.*" He does not say ye cannot. Here is the secret of all the trouble. The way into this beautiful temple is a lowly way. "*I am the way.*" "And there was no comeliness in him, but as a root out of a dry ground." But by and through this lowly way all must come. "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." Joseph, the learned counselor of the Sanhedrin; Nicodemus, the ruler of the Jews; Saul, the proud and learned Pharisee; Galileo and Newton, the mighty philosophers; Wellington and Washington, the great generals; Gladstone and a Webster all bowed at this

lowly door and found admittance; and millions upon millions of the laboring, toiling, weary, burdened masses have found entrance through this lowly door; and the promise is as wide as the race, "*Whosoever will* may come."

This is the natural way as well as the only way. The laborer works all the week and on Saturday receives the end of his reason, faith and work—his wages; the farmer sows his grain, and in the harvest reaps the results of his reason, faith and work in a golden reward. He sows abundantly; he waits patiently and believingly through the winter's snows and cold. He rejoices in the spring and shouts his "harvest home." This is a satisfactory way. There is no one truth more fully established. While we cannot expect all the blessed rewards of reason, faith and works in this life, but like the farmer who does his part, receives all along a blessed result, but the full benefit at the last, so the Christian receives a hundred fold in this world, and in the next eternal life. The hundred fold consists in a blessed assurance or foretaste of heaven; a sweet peace that passeth all understanding; the abiding presence of God; the removal of the sting of death. All fear of death, as of a conquered foe, is removed; the constant testimony of dying friends, as well as that of Christians in all ages that death is not to be dreaded, and that the manifestations in death are wonderful and precious. As the flush of day breaks the darkness and supercedes the stars before the opening glory of the king of day, so the testimony of the ages is, that "It is not death to die."

From Stephen until now the testimony has been and is the illumined face, the opening heavens, the joyous shout, "O, death, where is thy sting; O, grave, where is thy victory?" while sinners and unbelievers universally dieth, as the tramp spends the winter, in the cold and darkness. "I am taking a leap in the dark." "I am abandoned by God and man." "Shall I sue for mercy? Come, come, no weakness; let's be a man to the last." "I shall be glad to find a hole to creep out of the world at."

Is this glorious knowledge of "life beyond the grave" by our author's third method? We answer, no; but by a rational faith, tested by a personal acquaintance with Jesus Christ, its author, "who has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." "Who was believed on in the world and received up into glory." And while it is sad, it is nevertheless true, that "straight is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto *life*, and few there be that find it."

SEVENTH INCONSISTENCY.

Our author's inconsistency shows itself in an overwhelming manner in the way he compels everything to pay tribute to his theory of spirit-man and body-machine. He claims to submit it to the reason (page 13), but his imagination, his memory, his consciousness, and the Bible are used whenever he thinks they can be twisted to answer his purpose. I only quote one page (82): "Let us look at that babe for an illus-

tration. When it is first placed upon the mother's breast it is to her mind a most beautiful thing, but to nobody else's mind, for a babe is never beautiful—it becomes so afterward. A mother's enthusiasm covers it with a halo, and to her heart and eye it is more beautiful than an angel when it is laid upon her bosom. But if you should go there after two or three days and look down into the face of the child you would find simply a lump of flesh; no indications of anything else; for a baby's eye has no more intelligence in it than a doll's eye, not a particle. There it lies, unintelligent and incapable of expression, breathing and nursing at the mother's breast, *as purely a little animal as ever there was in the forests of the world*. But go forward *fifteen days* from the time it was put on the mother's breast—it is yet small, and its life imperfectly developed, but do you not see somebody looking out of the window at you? Do you not see that something has come there with an interrogation point? This is a baby's soul."

Was an author of a theory ever so hard pushed? Must a new-born babe be forced into the arguments, traduced and slandered. I know Jesus illustrated by infants, took them in his arms and blessed them. He did not say, hand me that little animal, but he said, suffer them to come to me for of such is the kingdom of heaven. St. Luke said ch. 18:15, "They brought unto him infants" (*brephee*.) The revised version has it rendered babes. St. Peter said, "as new-born babes (*brephee*) desire the sincere milk of the word."

According to the Jewish custom of presenting the babe at the eighth day for circumcision, it is most probable that these infants were eight days old; strange our author did not say eight instead of fifteen, then he might have made a point so that the soul-birth and circumcision should be coeval. Or he might have put it according to the theologians of Holland in the seventeenth century, who determined exactly that the soul of a boy was created forty days and girls eighty days after conception, and this would have saved the temptation of some mothers from killing the little brute. Our author said in a sermon at the New Jersey Conference, at Trenton, in his Sunday morning sermon, 1887, that last week, here in Trenton, there were two babes born. The one a little animal, the other a little angel. The mother pressed the little animal to her breast. The friends said what a sweet babe. They clothed and cared for it. After awhile, a few weeks, that mother will be looking into the little animal's eyes, and she will start back and say, "I see another babe looking out of the first babe's eyes at me."

"The first babe is as purely an animal as ever was born in the woods. The spirit-babe, the invisible babe, is the true babe. The mother is mistaken in thinking that little animal her babe. The spirit-babe is her proper babe. The first babe will sicken and die, and she will handle its cold form and weep as she lays it in the grave, but her real babe will slip away from her, leaving the little animal forever." Page 28, our author says: "These babes are completely and

utterly dissimilar." "They have absolutely nothing in common."

Is it necessary to pause to show the inconsistency of such philosophy? The kitten is born blind, rather with closed eyes. Is it therefore not a kitten until it opens its eyes?

I have failed to notice any such distinction in the seven children that have been born to us. They have differed as to their quickness to notice the mother peering into the little eye; also in taking food, and development of limb, and in cutting teeth, but I never thought the first expression of intelligence in the eye, or smile on the lip, any more than the cry, was the "coming of a babe's soul." I supposed the soul and body were begotten in conception, and both developed harmoniously, and that they together made a child, and that they were both born at once, and the one was as perfect in its development as the other, and that the lack of intellectual development was no argument that there was no mind, or soul, only that it was not developed, any more than the lack of development in the body (it only being able to nurse) proved that it had no body. In fact, if development was necessary, I should rather think we better wait until the power to know right from wrong had developed. Two babes born last week of one mother, and yet not twin! One an animal, one an angel. Babe No. 1 is a little animal, as much so as ever was born of a wild cat. It has claws and toes, eyes and ears, hair and skin, flesh and blood. It eats and grows, kicks and bites, sings and cries—well, everything that any animal does;

"it is as much an animal as ever was born in the woods." Of course it propagates its species; then dies to give room for its young animals.

Babe No. 2 has what? Eyes and ears, a nose and mouth, stomach and bowels? Oh! no! no! No. 2 uses No. 1's eyes, &c. Oh! No. 2 has no eyes and ears, no mouth and nose, no stomach and bowels, no brains. He that is the proprietor and master, the angel babe, has no need for these things. He only uses those of Babe No. 1. Well! well! I should think him a very dependent kind of a proprietor. But if he has no eyes or ears, no nose or mouth, or stomach or bowels; no flesh or blood, or brains, what in the world has he? If he has nothing in common with Babe No. 1, what has he? If he has no eyes or ears, what a queer looking object he must be? If he has no brains, how does he think? And if he has no feet and legs, or wings, how does he get about? What a pity our author did not tell us what he had, since he has nothing in common with Babe No. 1. I know our author tries to help his case by a foot-note, claiming that he does not mean "that the spirit is not present until several days," &c., but he does not help the matter. Are there two babes? Is the No. 1 purely an animal? Where is No. 2 these fifteen days? If Babe No. 1 dies within fifteen days, what becomes of No. 2?

Can it be that a great Bishop can think so of the human body divine in which the Holy Ghost deigns to dwell? And even Jesus took upon him our nature and was made in all points like unto us, not the nature of the angel babe, for the suffering of death. Ah,

sad must be the day for the Christian world when such theology as this shall be accepted.

“The shepherds came in haste and found the babe lying in the manger; and on the eighth day he was taken to the temple for circumcision, and Simeon, that aged and devout man, unto whom it had been revealed by the Holy Ghost that he should not die until he had seen the Christ, took him up in his arms, and said: ‘Now, Lord, lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.’” Were there two babes here? one an animal the other an angel; and had they nothing in common? Which did the shepherds find in the manger, and which one did Simeon say was the Lord’s Christ, which he had seen? And which one was the world’s Redeemer?

CONCLUSION.

Our author cannot fail to see the fundamental difference between his system, "man is a spirit," and its logical sequence, the spirit never dies, the body never has a resurrection; and the system of man's "materio-spiritual nature" and its logical sequence, the spirit leaves the body for a season, and the final reunion at the resurrection. I am sure no thoughtful reader will doubt this conclusion. As Rev. Dr. D——, a friend of mine, and an admirer of the teaching of "Beyond the Grave," admitted to me that "there can be no doubt but there is a wide difference between Bishop Foster's teaching and the teaching of the church, and that it is not a difficult task in this respect to show that his teaching is not orthodox." This should be sufficient; this is all that should of necessity be conceded to cause a demand for an investigation; and yet no halt is called: and when I sent charges through my presiding elder to the General Conference, no notice was taken of them any further than to put them into the waste basket. What is to be done? Has it come to this, in the early days of Methodism, even while she reaches out to pluck the sheaves of the first fruits of the harvest she allows a Bishop to sow broadcast the seeds of heresy

which shall bring forth a withering mildew? Is this the function of a Bishop? Has it come to this, that instead of being set as a guard to expose and drive away strange doctrines from our midst, he arrogates to himself the prerogative of an innovator? Has it come to this, that a Bishop may sit in his high place and write, and preach from the episcopal pulpit Swedenborgianism, Pelagianism, and sentimental rationalistic guess-work; forcing out our old-fashioned orthodoxy with impunity? Have we so far degenerated that in the very beginning of our career we have not enough real genuine love of the unadulterated truth of our church to attend to our doctrines and discipline simply because a great Bishop chooses to promulgate his own strange hallucinations? I believe we have, but it is a very delicate task. The Board of Bishops feel a delicacy in criticising a brother Bishop for various reasons. The official papers know the delicacy of sitting in judgment upon the work of a Bishop; and no doubt some few (very few, indeed, I think) of our ministers in all of the ranks of the ministry sympathize with our author's heresy. Among others we might name Rev. Dr. Daniel Curry, who has had no little hand in the upper circles of our Methodism for the last decade. But who doesn't know the difficulty in dealing with a heresy of this kind? If he had advocated a second probation, a limited atonement, or man's evolution from the monkey, he might have been churched, but when he leaves the limbs and leaves of the tree of doctrine

untouched, and strikes under ground at the taproot, he remains a magnificent Bishop. "Man has no soul; he is a soul." "Man is a spirit." "There are no facts which point to a return to life of the body which is destroyed." "Death is not by sin." Sin, which entered the world "by one" man, is *new*, while death is ancient." Who doesn't know these to be taproots of our system, which he so ruthlessly cuts off? and yet, because he cuts under ground, he seems to have gotten his work in well, "like the mole, while the farmer slept." But who doesn't know that when a Bishop in the past has swung away from orthodoxy, it has been a difficult task to bring him to justice? See *e. g.*, the "History of Rationalism," Bishop Colenso; and yet he denied the atonement, endless punishment; or Canon Farrar, of the English church. Hence it is not to be wondered at that our author has been allowed to go free, when we consider his age, his ability and his piety. But oh, shall we now, in the very foundation-laying period of our history, allow even a Bishop, who has so far forgotten his position and responsibility, as to allow himself to become the conscious or unconscious medium by which a fundamental truth of our holy Christianity has been stabbed, even to the very heart? Shall we, I say, allow this in the very beginning when, to me at least, I see in Methodism, pure and simple, the means by which scriptural holiness is to be spread over the world, and the kingdoms of this world brought to Christ? Shall we, as four millions of our people,

spread out over this great republic from ocean to ocean, and from the lakes to the gulf, everywhere united as a solid army against rum, Romanism and infidelity; shall we, as we are girdling in other lands the old trees of idolatry and Romanism; shall we, who are capturing the islands of the sea, and causing the desolate and solitary places to be glad, and the watchmen to cry, The day dawns; shall we, above all others, allow this insidious heresy to flow from the head centres of our beloved church as an insidious poison, down through every pore of our great Zion? O, God of Wesley, of Fletcher, of Watson, forbid! I beseech thee, forbid! O, God of St. Paul and of the martyrs, forbid it! O, God of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom thou didst raise from the dead, and crowned His mortality with immortality at Thy right hand, forbid that we, as the great centre and forefront, of Thy church militant, should allow such a calamity to come upon us.

I am persuaded, yea, I know, that our author is wrong—fundamentally, eternally wrong. I have made my protest in the proper disciplinary course. I now appeal to the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of which our author is a member. I appeal to the editors of our church papers, and periodicals, and publishers. I appeal to every Methodist preacher, yea, to every Methodist of our whole church; and to the universal church of our Lord Jesus Christ I appeal for help. It must not, it shall not be that our grand old doctrines shall be attacked

with impunity by those who are set for the defence of our faith. It is bad enough in this world of sin and error to have to meet the attacks of our enemies. There is enough of rationalism in this land, brought across the sea, without having our Bishops, sitting upon their thrones of power, promulgating it at our expense. I demand that it shall not be palliated, winked at or smoothed over. I demand that "Beyond the Grave" be branded, as it is, *heresy*. And if published at all, it must be denominated "The Heresy of Bishop Foster."

Bishop Hurst (History of Rationalism, page 575) beautifully says: "We would not utter a syllable of needless alarm; but is it not time that the American Church take note of the efforts by which the rationalists of every grade, are striving to take away the cardinal truths of the Christian revelation? Their predecessors in Europe sought to make children ashamed of old truths, by casting sarcasm on the strong faith and evangelical piety of the forefathers."

"The church in this country has partaken of the pride awakened by our unexampled national prosperity, and many of her noblest sons had well nigh come to the conclusion, before the outbreak of the late civil war, that she must inevitably prosper." "But without faith nothing can be accomplished, and three decades may be sufficient to so change the whole aspect of our religious life that the church may become thoroughly rationalistic; her sanctuaries frequented, and her posts of honor occupied, by the

worshippers of reason. The fidelity of the past will not be able to meet the emergency of the present." "Our civilization is undergoing a complete revolution." "If this land is to be blessed with pure faith, as in past years, a faith strong enough to repel every blow of skepticism;" "If we would secure for future years an uncorrupted faith," "The duty of the present hour must be discharged."

Thus, I have tried to discharge my duty. God alone knows my heart. The future alone can disclose the results. And now with a faith unshaken, I launch my humble efforts upon the current of the world's literature, hoping and praying that the guiding spirit of God may direct its usefulness and its destiny, and if I shall bear some humble part in the promulgation of truth in battling with error, to God be all the glory.

NOTE.—Since writing the conclusion to my unpretentious volume I had placed in my hands a little volume written by L. B. Caldwell, Professor of Physics in East Tennessee Wesleyan University, published in 1884. It is written with a strong hand and should be read by every one reading "Beyond the Grave." I find myself supported by this Professor of Physics as against our author. In his editorial he says: "Its general tendency is deranging if not damning. It starts out with the theory which it purposes to fix in your mind, reckless of the wrecks it leaves by the way. . . . He covers himself carefully under the wing of the Bible, but is careless of the havoc he makes of its teachings. To the author of 'Beyond the Grave' the resurrection means no more than it did to Emanuel Swedenborg. These authors seem to think very closely together, and if the teachings of the Methodist church

are true, this volume, 'Beyond the Grave,' is distracting, damaging and damning. . . . If the teaching of this volume be true, the apostles and early Christians were mistaken about the resurrection of Christ, and the thoughts clustering about an Easter Sabbath are a farce."

Again, as to the importance of the subject (page 7): "No class of thoughts act more energetically in forming human character than those which relate to 'Beyond the Grave.' . . . And nowhere may error take quicker and more vigorous root."

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE. |
|---|-------|
| INTRODUCTION, by a Methodist Minister of Many Years . | 3 |
| PREFACE, by the Author | II |
| CHAPTER I—"Is Man a Spirit?" | 25 |
| CHAPTER II—Is Man a Spirit? | 35 |
| CHAPTER III—Bishop Foster's Heresy in the Light of the Resurrection as Taught by the Christian Church from the Apostles until Now . . | 54 |
| CHAPTER IV—Bishop Foster's Heresy in the Light of the Resurrection as Taught by the Holy Scriptures | 74 |
| CHAPTER V—Bishop Foster's Heresy Compared with other Heresies, "Pelagianism" and "Swedenborgianism" | 99 |
| CHAPTER VI—Some of Our Author's Inconsistencies . . | 127 |
| First Inconsistency | 127 |
| Second Inconsistency | 128 |
| Third Inconsistency | 143 |
| Fourth Inconsistency | 167 |
| Fifth Inconsistency | 171 |
| Sixth Inconsistency | 179 |
| Seventh Inconsistency | 198 |
| CONCLUSION | 204 |





Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: August 2005

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16086
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 652 337 7